SIGHTING-IN SHOTS

CLED E. WALLACE

Brother De Forest Murch's classification of religious journals among us is interesting. The Christian Standard, of course, is tops and the very hub of conservatism. Going out the liberal way, the Christian Century is on "the lunatic-fringe." I suppose the Christian Evangelist comes in somewhere between. Brother Murch has the Christian Leader necking the Christian Standard somewhere near the hub. Going out the radical, hobbystic way, the Bible Banner is on "the lunatic-fringe." I take it that the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation come in somewhere between, at times displaying some degree of sanity. As a religious psychiatrist, I think Brother Murch is a failure. Since he is both a premillennialist and a digressive, his classification of the Bible Banner sounds like a compliment to me. A man with two shots of religious marihuana like that is likely to imagine that he's the hub and make strange observations on "the lunatic-fringe." When they get to Indianapolis, I hope Brother Witty tries to sober him up instead of taking his obsessions as evidence of inspiration.

It seems to me that the "decent and fairminded" brethren who were properly surveyed by Brother Davidson and his friends are getting a dirty deal. They made it clear that they did not relish "personal attacks" and subscribed for reading material of an elevating type. Ever since that survey was made, the surveyors or their friends, have foisted upon these "decent and fairminded" brethren a series of "personal attacks" that they did not subscribe for, or ask for, but on the other hand said they did not want. They have shipped bales of it all over the country to people all of whom are non-subscribers. Now take the Bible Banner on the other hand, it goes to subscribers, people who want it and pay for it. People who do not like it do not have to take it. It seems to me that Brother Murch has located his "lunatic-fringe" at the wrong place.

Don't anybody read this but preachers. The editor of the Bible Banner hasn't been lost to the brotherhood for twenty years but has been very much in evidence for at least that long. He does, however, suffer one disadvantage. It might help him if he had an estate on which he could entertain preachers whose influence might be of help to him in this fight he is making. If he could make his home a sort, of mecca for certain influential men, pay their fare both ways, entertain them lavishly and present them an autobiography done in oil and sprinkled with holy water, and send them home duly impressed, he might get somewhere. The fact is though he has been too busy preaching the gospel and defending the faith to make any money and if he had an estate he wouldn't know what to do with it. If he ever gets lost in digression and sectarianism and finds himself with a lot of money and an estate, he needn't send for me. I wouldn't know how to act when I got there, and I wouldn't read his autobiography if it had the angel Gabriel painted on the frontispiece. Under such circumstances, if he had any business with me, he could come to see me and pay his own expenses. All of which faintly recalls an old fable which begins with "Said the spider to the fly."

Some time ago The Christian Standard in a spirit of elation told how the Christian Leader came to be enlarged (from a weekly to a semi-monthly). They agreed on a survey of the brethren. It was taken in an efficient and businesslike manner, and revealed that the younger and more progressive elements overwhelmingly favored their views. Brother Clinton Davidson, the chief promoter of the new paper, hastened to the columns of the Standard for what that paper calls "An Encouraging Correction." He informs the readers of the Standard that "the older men, in my opinion, were just as decent and fairminded as the younger. The great majority of those who replied have objected to "personal attacks on honorable men." Now let's pet this thing straight. Who objects to "personal attacks?" The brethren from coast to coast have been deluged with "personal attacks" on the editor of the Bible Banner. They have been vituperative. The evident design of these attacks which are still going on, is to ruin him. Brother Davidson himself has sown the country down with a circular directed at the veracity of the editor. He did this at considerable expense unless Uncle Sam and the printers are more generous with him than they are with us. A prominent department head of the new paper recently went out of his way in the pulpit of a Texas church to attack the editor of the Bible Banner and used the word "LIE." My sister was in the audience and heard him and told me about it. If I were not so nice I'd call his name, but from what he said I think he would prefer that his name not appear in our paper. Fact is, I don't think he hurt the editor any. It is all right, of course, for these brethren to be better than we are, if they can. But we do not think it fair for them to sail under false pretenses. It looks like they carry sugar in one hand and acid in the other and do not believe in letting the right hand know what the left hand doeth. What the department head said in the pulpit and what Brother Davidson put in his circular could not, of course, go in the Leader. The Leader read-
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Lincoln said: “Let the people know the truth and this country is safe.” If this is true of a nation, it is true of the church. God sent his Son to deliver people from ignorance. He said: “Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.” There is freedom in truth—but one must know the truth. Whoever said ignorance is bliss was as far wrong as Shakespeare was off when he said “there is nothing in a name.” The shackles of ignorance are Satan’s fetters. Only the incisive power of truth can cut them through, unloose the bands that bind to error, and set us free. Lincoln’s words apply with a significant force to the issues before us today. On every hand we hear it said in this vein: We are not troubled with any of these errors andisms here, our people do not know anything about them, they are wholly ignorant of such issues. The evident idea is that ignorance is bliss! And some of our brethren are advertising their ignorance by putting it in the paper that they do not know what Premillennialism is, and do not want to know. But they speak with an air and tone of authority nevertheless in saying that it is a harmless theory. They do not know what it is, but there is no harm in it! How would you like for your doctor to proceed on that basis. He would say: I don’t know what is in this prescription, but it won’t hurt you!

There has not been a time in our generation when there have been more apologies for error and more tolerance of evil than now. We muse over the amazement that would follow the travels and preachings of a Paul in the church itself today. The world mobbed him then; the church would mob him now.

We believe the truth should be known on all issues before the church. By the truth alone can the church be salvaged from the machinations of an element in the church today headed for a general compromise with prevailing conditions in religion, an element altogether too large to be ignored and too definite and determined in their plans to let the church be safe for sound doctrine.

It is history repeated. It was this element fifty years ago that drove the dividing wedges of instrumental music and missionary organizations and sundry innovations into the church. The brethren were guileless. Our dear brethren are. Many of them said then, as they say now, these questions have not disturbed us here—but their ignorance was not bliss. Silently and stealthily the innovations crept in and in many places took over the churches about like Hitler and Mussolini take over the territories they covet. Preachers then were “neutral”—but practically every one who was neutral went with the digressive. Had it not been for brave and courageous men who cared more for the truth than personal praise and fortune, the church would have been entirely swept away.

The music question was not the real issue then—the real issue was back of the church and toward the author-ity of New Testament teaching and example in worship. The question of instrumental music was only the horse they rode out on. Today, Premillennialism is not the actual issue. This is seen when that issue is supposedly settled by some who say that they do not believe the doctrine—but! The “but” means that the real trouble is still here, a general softness in attitude toward error and compromise, and the premillennial question is again the horse that some ride out on.

Looking back over the history of things, shall we passively drift along in the course of the least resistance, or shall we fight as did those valiant men a half-century ago, to whom the church in Texas and Tennessee, owes its very existence today. Look at the North—where the fight was not made. Look at the South and West—where the fight was made. Then take a perspective of what will happen again-if the fight is not made.

This is why those papers which have been published for nearly a century in defense of the primitive gospel should not, and must not, modify their offensive warfare on all error. Christianity is not defensive merely—it is militantly offensive. But if it were defensive only, war has been declared on the church by the combined forces of false doctrines and worldliness, and it is past time to mobilize. It is a tragedy that there is a definite indication of modification in policy of the papers. The announcements of editorial policies clearly indicate it, and where no policies have been announced, there is an obvious lack of interest in the defense of the church that the crisis demands. I am no Paul Revere. I have no role to play. But I believe I know that we are in a fight which may assume all the proportions which digression did fifty years ago.

There is a dangerous weakness in preaching. Reproof, rebuke and correction of error in preaching are being discouraged. Papers will not even give their own editors carte blanche to unmask error and sin. Men whose influence has admittedly been on the wrong side of issues are courted and curried because of a following they hold. The damage already wrought in the church is great enough, but a more blasting menace may be stayed by forthright action. It will take plucky preachers and constant campaigning and penchant pens, with a disregard of personal fortune in a fight wherein the Cause is imperiled.

For long the Bollistic blight has been a malignant growth in the body of Christ. The reason it does not alarm is because, like a cancer, its growth is internal and silent. It exists in multiple but unrecognized forms. The “vaccines” of preachers and churches so much in evidence in some quarters nowadays has been taken utmost advantage of by the crafty manipulations of the Boll party, which with all of his lieutenants and sympathizers, and the neutrals thrown in, form a sizeable party, and compose a menace to the New Testament church. Congregations all over the country are potential recruits to this evil army in one regimen of it or another. The only thing that can save the situation for the Cause is that forthright public attack on
his party and such direct exposure as will force them out in the open to a square meeting of the issues that have been forced upon us in secret and sinister ways. Only this will smoke them out of that smear, say-nothing, sweet spirited method that has been outwardly adopted by this cohort of compromisers.

If the brotherhood can be aroused the tide of departure can be stemmed and stayed, but the old papers will have to scrap pop-gun flips and indirect reference to these evils, and instead pour mighty broadside salvos into this wickedness in doctrine, naming and exposing these teachers and the sin of their teaching and shaming all of their helpers and sympathizers, many of whom are professedly in our own ranks. We challenge the statement that these speculators are good men, because no man is good who rives the body of our Lord with his opinions, no matter whether that opinion be an organ or a theory! And we should declare here and now that we are as much of kin to the digressive yorner as we are to the Bollites and their unknown legion.

Division is upon us; we have no choice. Without direct action and the bringing of these false brethren to book, in a decade or less we shall see the speculators and compromisers in complete charge of our strongholds. The exposes that have been made have but fairly begun the task. The whole brotherhood is in a deep lethargic drowse. It will take mighty effort to arouse them to this purge.

If it be said that worldliness and sin are more important issues than errors and isms and general softness in doctrine, we answer that as bad as personal impurity and misconduct are, and they are bad enough, who can and will say that even the moral delinquent is a greater sinner than the man who winks at false doctrine and compromises the truth of the gospel? Since the world began God has extended clemency to men in their human weakness, but there is not a case on record where any man escaped who changed God's word or corrupted his worship. The latter is by far the more far-reaching because it affects the whole scheme of human redemption and the divine plan of the ages. And this is no apology for sin in anybody. But worldliness and wickedness are not to be found only among those who are stigmatized as radicals in their defense of the faith. There has been as much of that, yea more, among compromisers and apologists. The devil has always used the scandal club. "A lie will go around the world while truth is putting its boots on." The same tactics used today by a certain group in our midst were used by the digressive element in the church years ago-and it is now a known fact that there was more worldliness and downright wickedness among that element in the church, most of whom went with the digressives, than existed among those who were contending for the truth. And if the actual facts were known, the same would very likely be true today. Let these leaders submit their private and personal records for public inspection; let the one who has made such a great financial success during the time when he gave his all-absorbing attention to material things, submit all of his financial dealings, the details of the money he got and how he got it, his promotional enterprises and how he promoted them-and then let him cast the first stone. There is little to choose between the bad conduct of a man, regardless of who he is, and the course of another leading man who pretends to be loyal to God's way, but betrays the cause by lending such encouragement to the enemy as all but blocks everything we can do to keep the faith pure.

The burden of this screed is to hearten preachers of the gospel and elders of the church who may read it. It is no one-man task. That all who believe and love the truth may unite in this great cause is the theme of my prayers to God.-F. E. W. Jr.

WHAT SHOULD BE PRINTED

The Christian Leader recently announced that an editorial board of "business men" and others scattered over the country, whose names will remain unannounced, will be polled by letter when the editor does not know whether to publish an article or not. The Gospel Advocate also announces two editorial boards-one a general board to meet at intervals to shape the policy of the Advocate, and another special committee to advise the editor. This is intended to serve the purpose of distributing responsibility and everybody these days wants somebody else to take the responsibility. If it is a board, it is quite impersonal and nobody knows who hung the jury.

Brother B. C. Goodpasture, the Advocate's new editor, is held in highest esteem by this editor. I do not believe his personal soundness has even been questioned or that it could be justly questioned, and in character there are no finer men in the church. What I am about to say carries no reflection or fling in his direction, nor at any other individual.

The first notable instance of the restrictions of a new and modified policy is found in the case of C. B. Douthitt's article, in this issue of the Bible Banner, in reply to a recent article in the Gospel Advocate by G. C. Brewer. Since Brother Brewer's article appeared in the Gospel Advocate one would naturally expect the reply to be made through the Advocate. In fairness to Brother Douthitt it should be said that he submitted the article to the Advocate, but it does not conform to the lately announced policy, so Brother Douthitt must seek other columns. In all due respect to the Advocate, the personnel of which are my friends, I feel compelled to say that a policy that bars a reply to Brother Brewer's article should have barred his article also. It is hard to see the fairness of a policy that will permit G. C. Brewer to say about everything that he wants to say about anything, and then invoke an editorial policy against any effective reply to it. I am trying to say this in love.—F. E. W. Jr.

SIGHTING-IN SHOTS
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ers get the sugar out of the right hand. Some of the rest of us have tasted the acid out of the left. "Out of the same mouth cometh forth blessing and cursing." The mouth is equipped with a double spout. It spouts blessings in the Leader and cursing into circulars and pulpets. "My brethren, these things ought not to be."

Paul said "upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper, that no collections be made when I come." (1 Cor. 16:2) "Let each man do according as he hath purposed in his heart: not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver." (2 Cor. 9:7) But why bring that up? Paul was appealing to people who "first gave their own selves to the Lord and to us through the will of God." (2 Cor. 8:5) The other kind care nothing for what Paul said about giving or anything else. I'm afraid the Witty-Murch unity conference will ultimately have something to worry over besides the organ question. Or are such carnal schemes for raising money for religious purposes to also be classed as "mint, anise and cummin"? $100 per plate doesn't sound like it. I'm afraid Peter would have to eat in the kitchen after the $100 boys have finished. He confessed that "silver and gold I have none."
TWENTY FIVE YEARS BEHIND TIME
CECIL B. DOUTHITT

In an article in the Advocate of Feb. 2, Brother G. C. Brewer suggests that "the premillennial leaders meet with a group of brethren of unquestioned sincerity and soundness and see" if the premillennial leaders can be "persuaded to hold their views in private henceforth" and not "say anything about them. Just believe them, if he (they) must; but discuss them, never at all."

What Has Already Been Done

"A glance at the index of the bound volumes of the Gospel Advocate" ought to be "sufficient to convince" Brother Brewer that the very thing he suggests has been done time and again during the last twenty-five years.

When the "premillennial leaders" first began to teach their theories here in Louisville many brethren on many occasions met with them for "consultation" and "conference," telling them that the teaching of their theories would cause "alienation and strife among good brethren," and pleading with them to "say nothing about them. Just believe them, if he (they) must; but discuss them, never at all.

They persisted in teaching their "disastrous" theories publicly and from house to house, nevertheless.

When Boll was writing for the Advocate "a group of brethren of unquestioned sincerity and soundness," including J. C. McQuiddy, F. W. Smith, M. C. Kurfees, A. B. Lipscomb and others met Boll in Nashville and got him to agree to hold his premillennial "views in private henceforth." Soon after this agreement he began to teach his speculative theories again, and then denied he had ever made such an agreement. These men who were then managing the Advocate expressed their disapproval of Boll's accusation that they had lied on him. Boll became aroused and called them "false and unrighteous. "the Nashville council," "scribes and Pharisees," "false brethren," and many other ugly names.

After E. L. Jorgenson had been teaching his premillennial views for a long time in the Highland church at Louisville, some of the brethren thought the teaching of such views would become "disastrous" to "the cause we love." Then they wrote Brother Brewer that the very thing he suggests has been done time and again during the last twenty-five years.

Then Brewer was writing an article, making a suggestion to "others of both sides," reiterating his love for the premillennial leaders, declaring he has "been blessed by them," and wind up by saying, "My duty is done. Others of both sides are responsible for what they do with it." What a sense of duty!

He cannot excuse himself on the ground that the premillennial leaders might "feel that some of their opponents would exact unreasonable concessions from them or put them under some sort of sectarian ban." The only "sort of sectarian ban" any of them has been placed under everlastingly is the ban that Clinton Davidson placed Boll under, when Davidson declared in a covenant with F. L. Rowe that Boll should never be editor of the Christian Leader. That "sectarian ban" has already been placed irrevocably on Boll, and Brewer's coming to Louisville for his proposed consultation could not make the ban any stronger.

These are only a few of the many attempts to get the premillennial leaders to "hold their views in private," and they are a matter of record as "a glance at the index of the bound volumes" of the Gospel Advocate will show.

Brewer's "Duty"

Brethren who are acquainted with these events of the last twenty-five years are not as helpful of the outcome of the proposed conference as Brewer seems to be. His suggestion for a "brotherly consultation" is about as belated as would be a suggestion that Hitler meet with Chamberlain now for a consultation regarding the dismemberment of Czecho-Slovakia. However, since Brother Brewer does have hope of reconciliation (else he would not have made the suggestion), it is obviously his duty to come to Louisville and meet Boll, Jorgenson, Janes, Neal and others and see "What Can Be Done About It." He ought to meet with them and ask them to do what he says somebody else ought to ask them to do, and what many others of "unquestioned sincerity and soundness" have asked them to do.

Brewer says he loves the premillennial brethren and has "never been ashamed or afraid to say so." We know he is loving and courageous because he says he is. Not afraid to "say. What bravery! A. B. Lipscomb and a score of others had love and courage enough to go to those brethren and try to save their souls and protect the church from what Brewer says is a "menace." If Brewer only had this kind of love and bravery! Notice the difference: "Let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and truth." (1 Jno. 3:18)

Then too, according to his article Brewer believes premillennialism "is causing alienation and strife among good brethren:" that it should "not one time be mentioned among us;" that it "has certainly proved disastrous;" that the cause we love "suffered enough on account of this blunder;" that it is a "menace;" that "something should be done about it." Then it is about as bad as any system of false doctrines could be, Brewer himself being the judge. And he has hope of stopping the whole system if somebody would only meet with the "premillennial leaders" for a "brotherly consultation." As long as he has this hope of reconciliation he cannot brush aside his responsibility by writing an article, making a suggestion to "others of both sides," reiterating his love for the premillennial leaders, declaring he has "been blessed by them," and wind up by saying, "My duty is done. Others of both sides are responsible for what they do with it." What a sense of duty!

A Few Questions

It is generally known what Brother Brewer's attitude would be toward the "premillennial leaders" after his consultation, if they do "agree to hold their views in private henceforth;" but in case he should fail as many others have failed in persuading them to do what Brother Brewer says they ought to do, a few questions are in order, and his desire to do the whole church "good, and not harm" ought to lead him to answer these questions in a public way at once.
1. After Brewer’s consultation with the premillennial leaders, if they refuse to hold “their views in private,” and persist in teaching theories which he says are “causing alienation and strife among good brethren,” and which are “disastrous” to the cause we love, then will he, as a teacher of God’s word, advise the brethren to apply Rom. 16:17 to the “premillennial leaders”?

2. If they promise him they will stop teaching these theories (as Boll promised McQuiddy, Km-fees, Smith and others in Nashville almost twenty five years ago), and then start to teaching them again and charge Brewer with lying on them when he tells they made the promise, and call him false and unrighteous, a scribe and a Pharisee, a false brother (as Boll did call the men mentioned above), then would Brewer “mark them ... and turn away from them”? (Rom. 16:17)

3. After Brewer asks Jorgenson to hold his “views in private,” if Jorgenson persuades the church in Lubbock to withdraw from Brewer for making that request of him (as he did persuade the Highland church to withdraw from two men of “unquestioned sincerity and soundness”), then would Brewer teach the brethren to “mark” Jorgenson and “turn away from” him?

4. How much more “disastrous” (than Brewer says it now is) must premillennialism become, and how much longer will “the cause we love” have to suffer “on account of this blunder” (than Brewer says it has suffered) before Brother Brewer will apply Rom. 16:17 to the teachers of this “menace?”

SPRING IS HERE AND THE COPPERHEADS ARE CRAWLING AGAIN — THIS TIME FROM ATLANTA, GEORGIA

JOHN T. LEWIS

This morning at our meeting at Fairview church, Brother John D. Cox, minister of the North Birmingham church of Christ handed me a seven page anonymous circular. Brother Jack Meyer, minister of the West End church of Christ, Brother Floyd Horton, of the Woodlawn church, and Brother W. C. Graves of the Tarrant church, all had received these letters. I suppose the author did not want to spend the postage on me. I called Brother Graves last night and asked him to bring his copy with him to the meeting. I wanted to see it; but he said he had just had a housecleaning, and his was gone. Brother Cox brought me his this morning; but asked me to return it, he said he was going to file it under “C” for coward.

Ever since I have known Brother Wallace he has signed his name Foy E. Wallace, Jr., but this sneak from Atlanta writes “Foy Esco Wallace, Jr.” fifteen times in his seven page paper. Why? The sole purpose of the letter is to discredit Brother Wallace, ruin his influence as a gospel preacher, and to kill the Bible Banner. Therefore I use the word sneak advisedly. It means “one who sneaks; a mean, cowardly fellow.” I can conceive of nothing more sneaking, or meaner than to try to destroy the influence of a faithful gospel preacher by inuendo spread over anonymous pages. And the reason for this unchristian, diabolical anonymous campaign against Brother Wallace is because of his fight against the twentieth century future earthly kingdom nonsense.

“Facts Free From Opinions On Two Subjects” is the caption of this latest anonymous outrage.

1. “Foy Esco Wallace, Jr.’s statements vs. Abilene Christian College and other colleges.” This saint (?) from Atlanta then publishes some photographed views of articles Brother Wallace published in the Bible Banner about our Bible colleges; but he does not publish a single denial of Wallace’s statement from any source. Versus means against, so I suppose this Atlanta saint (?) was giving the “facts” in this issue of his paper, and in the next issue he will give the “opinions” and thus complete his versus.

2. “The Accuracy of Foy Esco Wallace Jr.’s statements.” This anonymous saint (?) from Atlanta, Ga., does not try to make a “versus” out of the above by printing some “photographed” statements that the New York Rip Van Winkle, the father of the acme of religious journalism among “us,” had made, evidently either to squeeze some money out of the “Bible Banner Company” or to put the editor in the penitentiary, and every indication is that it would have been a pleasure to him to do both.

If Clinton Davidson is a business man, and a Christian, even if his business is twenty years ahead of his Christianity, he could know that it was possible for Brother Wallace to make every statement he made with the best intentions, and then something come up over which he had no control to prevent him from carrying out his intentions. If Clinton Davidson had had a spark of charity in his makeup, and had spent as much time and money to get information, as he did to get evidence with which his “eminent legal counsel” could squeeze money out of the “Bible Banner Company,” or to put Wallace in the “pen,” he could have learned that Brother Wallace’s statements were made in the best of faith, and not for the purpose of deceiving anybody. But since he failed to get any evidence that would justify criminal actions, he called off his “eminent legal counsel,” and turned loose a horde of anonymous puppets to flood the brotherhood with anonymous propaganda to destroy the influence of a faithful gospel preacher, and the most deadly foe of this legalistic, Judaistic, premillennial nonsense that began to develop among “us” about the time Brother Clinton Davidson went into religious retirement. If I know the brotherhood it would be better for Brother Davidson, and the paper he is sponsoring, if he would call his dogs off or in.

Finally this Atlanta saint (?) states a criminal action of “Sear Face Harry” and then frames a hypothetical question (or did Clinton Davidson’s “eminent legal counsel” frame it?), that he thought would show Wallace to be in “Sear Face Harry’s” class. He then says: “Nothing in this article is intended to reflect upon the motives, morals or integrity of Foy Esco Wallace, Jr.” When I read this barefaced statement I was caused to wonder if there is not something in the total depravity theory after all. There is also a photograph of a letter, in this Christian (?) document, from the “Secretary of State,” of the state of Texas, apparently written to nobody as there was no name on it, but the Secretary of State’s. If such unchristian tactics do not destroy Christianity from the earth, it cannot be destroyed.

RELAY IT ON THE GRAPEVINE

A faithful member of the church, who loves righteous; ness and hates iniquity, and who was not a subscriber nor so far as we know even a reader of the Bible Banner, received through the mail the scandal sheet from Atlanta, Ga., against the Bible Banner and its editor, and immediately sent one dollar to us for a year’s subscription to the Bible Banner! We have received many new subscribers and as there has been no organized campaign it is evident that the free publicity is at least causing people to want to see the thing everybody is talking about, and which Mr. Anonymous desires so much to destroy.—F. E. W. Jr.
THE LEADER OF THE NEW CHRISTIAN LEADER

When a man emerges from a twenty year retirement from his Christian duty, during which time he was giving himself to material things, but now feels that his secular success has been such that he can again direct attention to spiritual matters; when such a man appears on the scene as a Moses in the church, floods the brotherhood with questionnaires, surveys, and when his methods are criticized threatens the critics with "eminent legal counsel," it naturally begets doubt and everybody wants to know more about such a pretentious person and his propitious propositions. We have learned all we want to know about his material side of life—he made a success of that in the insurance business while he was "lost to us" in New York. Spiritually and religiously, nobody knew him well until recently, and he is about to let us all on the inside by certain statements, letters and other "straws" besides his straw vote.

For instance, in a letter to Brother C. W. Scott, of Winchester, Ky., a copy of which I have, Clinton Davidson says to Brother Scott:

"Someone told me that you do not live according to the commands and practices of the Scriptures, that is, you do not fast. I have gone on two fasts. Had nothing but water for three weeks each time, and have just completed a shorter one. I cannot work while fasting, but I can do better work afterwards. Yes, I pray also. Also, I have been away on a business trip."

So Brother Scott is unscriptural because he does not fast! This is the same kind of foolishness that the missionaries have gone off with who went out from Louisville—fasting, tongues, healing and direct Holy Spirit influence, etc. It traces back to the same thing. Davidson says he cannot work while fasting—we wonder how much fasting he did while he was making his howling success as an insurance man in New York. But he adds that he has "been away on a business trip." We all agree with him that twenty years is quite a business trip.

Another example of weakness is seen in the instance cited in Hugo McCord's article on another page—that Davidson admits instrumental music is wrong, but believes he can work and worship better with a digressive church that uses it! Is the "brotherhood" ready to accept his "leadership."

In another correspondence our Copyright brother had recently with an intimate acquaintance of mine, he offered to set this brother right on some "facts." The brother gave him authority for the "facts" he had made some use of, and then asked Davidson for some information that he wanted which he believed Davidson had, and could give him. First, it was commonly reported that Davidson was associated with the digressives during recent years—and he asked, Is that a fact? Second, it has ben reported that he inspired or has a guilty knowledge of the anonymous letters that have been put into mass circulation—and he asked, Is that a fact? The brother also told him that he understood that he (Davidson) was hostile toward our fight against premillennialism, and asked that he might have more information on such things. Now, such questions should be very easily answered. But did Davidson answer them? Well, he just went into a huff and declined further correspondence, even though he started the correspondence himself. He said the questions asked had been answered before, but he did not say when or where or what the answers were. As we have not seen the answers, we would all like to know what they are, and where he answered them.

Again, it is generally known that the New Christian Leader was promoted and purchased by Clinton Davidson—and copyrighted by him, Then it was turned over to the incorporation. Now, Davidson says that he has nothing to do with the New Leader, that he is not even a "director" in the incorporation, not even a stockholder. He is only an interested friend and a financial contributor, but has nothing to do with it officially or editorially. Ordinarily, we would accept that—but it is rather strange that this editor (myself-Foy Esco Wallace, Jr.) should receive the following letter on a Christian Leader letterhead:

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.,
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Gentlemen:
The Christian Leader, published at Cincinnati, Ohio, is being sent to you on an exchange basis.

Beginning January 1, 1939, the editorial office of the Christian Leader was moved to Nashville, Tennessee, 145 Fifth Avenue North.

Won't you kindly send your publication to the Nashville address hereafter?

Sincerely yours,

THE CHRISTIAN LEADER PUBLISHING CO. INC.

What's the point? It is just this: This letter on Christian Leader letterhead, though its publishing office on said letterhead is listed at Cincinnati, Ohio, was mailed in Davidson's return envelope, 931 Trust Company of New Jersey Building, Jersey, N. J., and the envelope bears the postmark of Jersey City, N. J., March 25, 3:30 p.m., 1939.

If Brother Copyright Davidson has no official connection with the New Christian Leader, rather strange that their business mail is going out of his office in Jersey City!

But let the reader not overlook the fact that the letter was addressed to me, in singular number, but I am called "Gentlemen." That is more than I expected—I am not only a gentleman in Brother Davidson's estimation, I am more than one gentleman.

While I am on the subject of letterheads and postmarks, let me also say that I have a letter from another acquaintance of mine who has received one of the anonymous folders which were issued from Atlanta, Ga., (some of them) but this one came in a letter postmarked Nashville, Tennessee, bearing the return of S. H. Hall. We are about to identify some of the anonymous tribe. The truth is, we have had rather definite connection all the time—Mr. Anonymous is not one person, he is a composite personage, many heads and hoofs and horns and toes and tails—the composite what? Brother Chas. Neal, in my debate with him, had a chart on the composite beast that had to come back into existence before the millennium started. Well, Mr. Anonymous is composite anyway. But if they are not more careful to cover up their tracks they might get caught up with and get some of their heads and hoofs cut off.

Back to the main line: When the brethren find out that the New Christian Leader, and in fact this whole new movement, is being promoted by a man who has been reared under Boll influence, left the South and went to New York on a twenty years "business trip," associated with the Digressives, says he lived on "nothing but water for three weeks each time" on two fasts, and has just "completed a shorter one," and thinks this must be done in order to "live according to the commands and practices of the Scriptures"—what will that ninety-five per cent who thought they favored his views think of this? It is now a question of whether this man has been lost or is still lost. Ninety-five per cent of a survey favoring those views would have to be taken among ascetics, monks and nuns of a Catholic monastery in medieval times. The only modern fellow that would fellowship him now in his three weeks fast on "nothing but water" is Mahatma Gandhi! Who mentioned "the lunatic fringe"? This is lunacy proper. If it all sounds silly, just read the quotation from his letter above and draw your own conclusions as to how safe a leader the New Christian Leader has for a leader. To the
Pharisees who fasted, Jesus said: "If the blind lead the blind, they will both fall into the ditch."

Incidentally, the new office of the Christian Leader, according to the notification we have from the New Jersey business office, is 145 Fifth Avenue North, Nashville. If that is not the address of Central Church of Christ, I have forgotten my Nashville numbers. Things are getting complicated!—F. E. W. Jr.

**BOMBARDING THE BROTHERHOOD**

CLED E. WALLACE

Well, of all things! Brother F. L. Rowe, veteran editor and publisher, is at it! Bombarding the brethren with circular letters must be ketchin’. It takes a lot of paper, stamps and printing to get and keep Brother Clinton Davidson in a favorable light before the brethren and we might pass Brother Rowe’s effort along that line without comment but for the fact that he charges Brother Davidson’s critics with being “jealous publishers.” Just for that, I’m going to return good for evil and help Brother Rowe get the facts of Brother Davidson’s religious ways and connections before the brethren. At least since such a Herculean effort is being made to sell him to the brotherhood, somebody ought to see to it that certain facts are not suppressed. As I see it the cause of truth demands this. In this connection, Brother Gardner is exceedingly anxious to furnish the means and directs the activities” of the Leader, and Brother Rowe is one of the directors, and retained “as advisor,” the Leader cannot be used to give the brethren what information they need directly, without resorting to circulars. They smile at us in the Leader and make faces at us in circulars.

While the Leader goes smilingly on its way, Brother Rowe clouds up in circular form and nags at us for “perverting” his remark in the Leader that Brother Davidson had been “lost to us for about twenty years” at the time he took a notion to revolutionize brotherhood journalism and use the Leader as an experiment along that line. He is horrified at our wickedness in misunderstanding him and attributes it to jealousy on our part. That would look bad in the Leader, but it is supposed to look all right in a circular! If I were a psychologist, I would be tempted to take some of these brethren apart, dissect them, in the interest of science. Brother Rowe assures us that “after you have read all this letter, you will be convinced that Brother Davidson was not ‘lost’ to the Lord, nor to the Lord’s work.” Well, I’m “convinced” that the Lord knew where Brother Davidson was all the time and what he was doing, but the point is that the brethren did not know, not even the congregations where he tried to “take membership by proxy” after plans had been formed to take over the Leader. Concerning this Brother Rowe himself said in a letter dated July 26, 1938:

> When I was at New York City church, Sunday, at the conclusion of the services, Brother Gardner, their fine young preacher, but totally inexperienced, announced to the congregation that Brother Clinton Davidson desired to be enrolled as a member of the New York City congregation. After the service I talked with Brother Davidson and learned that Brother Gardner had simply asked him to make such a request. Davidson has not been attending services there and he was not present when the statement was made by Brother Gardner. In fact, Brother Davidson is not known only to one or two of the members and I told Brother Gardner that that procedure was very unusual and I advised him to get in touch with Brother Wil-
The contract further specified that R. H. Boll of Louisville, Ky., shall never become an Editor of the Christian Leader.

In this connection he said that Brother Davidson “furnishes the means and directs the activities” and spoke of “the great program he outlines in the next issue of the Leader.

In the light of all this it is fairly clear that Brother Davidson is not fairly itching for the Leader to do any great amount of harm to the cause of digression and premillennialism. And he possibly won’t be disappointed.

Brother Rowe hastens to assure us that “Brother Davidson is not the owner or publisher of the Christian Leader.” Neither am I the owner or publisher of the Bible Banner but I know who is. And while we are on the subject, I have some more information about Brother Davidson, over his signature, which may be of interest, inasmuch as his friends want him to be fully known to the brotherhood. He wrote a brother a letter of very recent date in which he chided him for not fasting, charging that he did “not live according to the commands and practices of the Scriptures.”

I have gone on two fasts. Had nothing but water for three weeks each time, and have just completed a shorter one. I cannot work while fasting but I can do better work afterwards.

The brother seems to be a crank, in addition to several other things that incapacitate him as a Moses in “higher standards of journalism” among us. Brother Rowe says of him that “He has avoided publicity.” It seems to me that it would have been better for the cause of truth if he had succeeded.

The new Leader has something to outlive in the way it got going, and I hope it succeeds. A little or more stiffening wouldn’t hurt it. It needs a little more time in its bones to stand up straight. You can’t fight error by ignoring it, at least you can’t adopt that as a fixed policy. When you do, the chances are you’ll have to do some circular work on the side. My friend, Jimmie Lovell, is trying to quiet me down and reassure me and I am not unappreciative of his efforts nor wholly unsympathetic. He says:

The Christian Leader will never sympathize with premillennial teachings, instrumental music in worship or otherwise denominationalism or sectarianism as long as I am a part of it. Cled, why don’t you believe this?

All right, Jimmie, I’ll try to, but it would sound better to me if you would strike out “never sympathize” and substitute always oppose. However, if you will see to it that the Leader never sympathizes, some of the rest of us will furnish the always opposes, and may it turn out that “we’ll understand one another better, and love one another more.”

“JUST THE FACTS”

It becomes our present duty, in keeping with the promise made in the last Bible Banner, to state “just the facts” regarding the announcements appearing in the Gospel Advocate and the Bible Banner just prior to the introduction of this magazine to the reading public. It was announced that the Bible Banner would be launched “Under Safe Management” and that it would be incorporated by J. W. Akin, J. B. Williams, George W. Birchfield, Cled E. Wallace, Austin Taylor, and Foy E. Wallace, Jr. It was also stated that the company would be capitalized and made financially safe. These promises were all made in good faith. The brethren mentioned had all agreed to such an arrangement and consented to the use of their names as they appeared.

A short time before this announcement, my long time friend, Leon B. McQuiddy, of the Gospel Advocate, proposed to finance a paper in the west, and to back me in the publication of it. It was his intention to incorporate the paper and capitalize it for a sufficient amount of money to secure its future as a permanent magazine. All statements which appeared in the papers were printed under Brother McQuiddy’s personal okey, and the issues of the Bible Banner containing these announcements were printed on his press.

At this time, Brother McQuiddy doubtless believed that he could promote this paper in the west to both his advantage and that of the Cause generally, though he said that he expected to lose considerable money on the venture for at least two years; after that he felt that it might become a financial success.

Various and sundry matters delayed the business details, and then, finally, incorporation of the Bible Banner was abandoned by Brother McQuiddy, with his request of me ‘that he be released from the agreement and permitted to withdraw from the management of the paper entirely and have me launch out again on my own. In consideration of this unexpected development, Brother McQuiddy offered some further financial assistance as a contributor to the paper until it could become stabilized. While this was a great disappointment to me, I have never wanted any man to do anything that he did not want to do. I had not made any propositions to Brother McQuiddy when the paper was started; he had made the propositions, to me. I accepted them; and when he later desired to be released, there was no alternative but to release him, and if there had been I would have released him anyway. He doubtless has reasons which he considers valid, however, I feel that influence and pressure from various sources caused Brother McQuiddy to come to this decision, as nothing exists in connection with my own affairs now that did not exist before, of which neither McQuiddy knew unless he knows something that I did not know. Be all of this as it may, the Bible Banner never sympathizes with the great program he outlines in the next issue of the paper. If this was not a threat to sue some or all of them, then evidently his letter must be interpreted as an effort to intimidate those men who were thought to be backing this paper. It may be that Brother McQuiddy felt that, as an editor, I am too stormy and might involve him in tangles with such men as Clinton Davidson who had intimations upon numerous occasions that he would sue me and others if we did not behave. Of course, it would not do any of them any good to sue me, but they might get plenty out of Leon McQuiddy. I do not blame him for not wanting to be sued over what I might say about Clinton Davidson, as I have in other instances referred to him as what I believe to be enemies of the New Testament church. Situated as he is, threats to sue might have effect, but it will take more than New York “eminent legal counsel” and Philadelphia lawyers to call me off.

Feeling that perhaps I had been done some financial injustice, Brother McQuiddy very generously offered to nay me a liberal monthly salary to discontinue the Bible Banner and write for the Gospel Advocate once a week under an editorial committee. Possibly I need one; but I knew I was not worth as much more than his other writers as
was offered me; and I could not have been true to the trust of my friends who believed what we said about the permanence of the Bible Banner, if I had discontinued it. I would rather work for nothing and be true to my personal convictions than to receive as much per day as was offered me per month. Therefore, without reflecting on any man's motives in the matter, but in what I considered duty's demands, thanking Brother McQuiddy for his offer, I nevertheless refused, not knowing the destiny of the Bible Banner, but firm in determination that if it, should sink I would sink with it. My true and tried friend, John T. Lewis, immediately went down with the ship. My big brother, Cled Wallace, thought he would also sink or swim, but figured on swimming. He has always figured that way—and always swims. When on the school ground as boys, if a big bully jumped on me, Cled said, "All right, but you will have to take me, too." He is still the same big brother, and if you don't want to whip two, stay off both of us. Others like, Emmett G. Creacy, who never learned how to run from a fight, assured me that they were in there to stay. My life-long friend and fellow in the gospel, Austin Taylor, said that it was time to quit—except to "quit yourselves like men." We believed others would rally to the support of this paper which was begun in such good faith and pledged to the defense of the church of the Lord in this its greatest crisis in our generation. They did. And other statements appearing in this paper is the evidence that the present situation with the Bible Banner presents no emergency. It is secure on the present basis for a full two year period, at the end of which time we are confident that the Bible Banner will rival the best of our papers today in subscriptions and claims of patronage among the brethren. Already it circulates in about forty states of the U. S. A. and Canada. While we do not have the mass circulation that other papers have, the Bible Banner goes into the hands of those in most every place where its influence for the truth will be felt in the leadership of the church in that community.

We have waited several weeks for Brother McQuiddy to make a brief statement, and we would have much preferred that Brother McQuiddy had made a straightforward statement of these matters, but as he has felt hesitant to do so, I have relieved him of the necessity of doing so. This statement settles the matter so far as I am concerned. There is no feeling of enmity whatsoever, rather of disappointment. We have been friends for long; and I wish that it may ever be so.

As for the Gospel Advocate, its publishers and editors have my best wishes in everything they may do in righteousness, and all the encouragement I am able to give them in the direction of an unrelenting war on error. As for the Bible Banner, it goes on with no intention whatever of letting up in the fight we are waging. As for the meddlers in other men's matters who circulate anonymous letters, we wish that they could and would repent, and do what Paul said, "Study to be quiet and do your own business"—simply attend to their own business, and go to heaven, but if they persist in their present course and go to hell in the devilish course they are pursuing, there is nothing we can do about it, as the only way we have to avert them, not knowing who they are [except by suspicious evidence], is through the spirit of the press. But men who "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil" are seldom reached by any righteous appeal.

"Thou has given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth"—and by the help of our God and those who love his Cause, we aim to keep the Bible Banner waving.—F. E. W. Jr.
Saul of Tarsus was a Jew. He was born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, Asia. When we first met him it is in connection with the killing of Stephen who was preaching the Gospel of Christ. (Acts 7:45-60) Saul did not believe that Christ had been raised from the dead. He therefore, did not think that Christ was the Son of God and the Saviour of mankind. Saul thought all Christians were heretics and imposters, and according to the Jewish law should be killed. The Mosaic law taught that all persons that led people away from that worship should be killed. Jesus said, “The time will come when they that kill you will think that they do God service.” (Jno. 18:2) Saul was one of this class in thinking that Christians should be killed. He hated Christ and his followers. With this hatred in his heart he got authority from the high priest and the elders at Jerusalem to go to Damascus to arrest and bring to Jerusalem as captives all Christians that the found at Damascus. Accompanied by some other man he started toward that city, breathing out threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord. (Acts 9:1-2) As he was near the city Jesus appeared to him. (See the 9th, 22nd and 26th chapters of Acts) When Jesus appeared to Saul there came also a light out of heaven above the brightness of the sun and caused Saul to fall to the earth and also blinded him. Here began transactions that led to the complete reformation of the church’s most powerful enemy.

The Character Of Saul
A very large part of the religious world have wholly misunderstood the things that took place when the light appeared to Saul. At this time Saul was in the Jewish church, the Pharasaic sect, the straightest sect of the Jews. He was well educated, exceedingly zealous, profited above his equals, wholly conscientious, and lived up to the law of his religion blamelessly.

Should he have died with fright or heart failure when the light came, would he have gone to heaven? Almost the whole world says that good conscientious people who live up to what they think is right will be saved. Saul was doing that at the time the light came to him. Would he have been saved had he then died? Well, all we can know about it is just what the Bible teaches. Whereas the Bible says the foregoing about Saul it also tells in what condition he was at that time. The Bible says that he was a blasphemer, a persecutor, injurious, without mercy, in ignorance and unbelief (infidelity as to Christ), a murderer, chief of sinners, making havoc of the faith, persecuting the church, while breathing out threatenings and slaughter. One may ask if a conscientious, zealous church member who thinks he is doing right can be guilty of all these things hereinafter recalled. The Bible says in so many words that Saul was doing those very things. It is easily seen therefore, that conscience unguided by the New Testament will let a man persecute Christ and murder the fairest saints that walk the earth. That is exactly what occurred in Saul’s case. Then you may be conscientious, sincere and church members, and at the same time be wholly out of line with God’s teaching, fighting God’s ways and hating God’s church. Conscience is no guide but must be guided and the New Testament is the only thing by which it can be safely guided.

What Converted Saul
Another tremendous error in the minds of many is what the light did for Saul. The Bible says that the light made Saul blind, but many people think that the light converted Saul, that he became a believer at the time of the light and because of the light. This is wholly false. The light did not make Saul a believer nor was he converted and saved at the time the light came to him. Saul fell to earth and heard a voice calling him by name and asking him why he was persecuting him. But Saul did not know who was speaking to him. He did not dream that it was Jesus Christ of Nazareth that spoke to him. Had that voice said, ‘I am Michael’ or ‘Gabriel,’ no doubt Saul would have believed it. Saul asked who it was that was speaking to him. He would not have asked this question had he known who it was that was speaking to him. Inasmuch as Saul did not know who (though the light had come and caused Saul to fall to the earth and had also made him blind, and had probably passed away) the person was that spoke to him, the voice told him, ‘I am Jesus Christ of Nazareth.’ Then and there Paul learned that Jesus was actually alive. Thus Saul got his information and his faith concerning Christ from hearing, and not from a miracle. Hence Paul was right when he wrote that “faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God” (Rom. 10:17) Had Saul been converted by the light when the light came he would have been converted in infidelity so far as his faith in Christ was concerned. He did not believe in Christ till the word came; not when the light came, but later. Hence those who think he was converted by a light or a miracle and there and then made a believer, are wholly wrong as to the matter. Miracles do not convert, never did convert and never can convert people. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Through the gospel new ideas, new information, faith, desires, intentions and purposes are planted into the heart of man. These lead to a willing obedience to the will of God. When this is done the heart, the life and the relation or state of man are changed, and God then freely forgives him. Thus Saul was converted. He heard, he believed, he repented and he was baptized, then his sins were “washed away” or he was pardoned and saved. One may easily detect from the fact that miracles, four of them at least, took place with them that accompanied Saul, and yet they were not converted, so far as any one can learn from the Bible, that miracles do not convert people. The light shined around all, all who saw the light, all fell to earth and all heard the voice out of heaven; yet not one of them was ever a believer.
or saved so far as the record shows. So miracles do not convert.

Obedience vs. Experience

It may be noted that though people may have wonderful experience, bright experiences, which the denominations would accept with unanimous vote, yet such may not be converted at all, but may be actually open enemies to Christ and his church. You cannot depend upon some strange sight or strange voice, for they that were with Saul saw and heard strange things indeed, but were not thereby saved. You must hear, believe, and obey the gospel to be saved.

When was Saul’s conversion completed? When did he receive pardon? Saul asked the Lord what he would have him to do and the Lord told him to go into the city and there it would be told him what he must do. At this point Saul was a believer, a penitent believer, a praying, fasting believer, yet he was not pardoned. In obedience to Christ he went into the city. Ananias was sent to him to tell him what Jesus said he must do. When Ananias came to Saul he was not saved though he was and had been for three days a praying, penitent believer. Hence Ananias told him what to do, “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.” That therefore was the thing that Paul must do according to Jesus’ speech to him. Not withstanding he had seen the light, seen Jesus and talked to him yet he must be baptized to have his sins washed away. This being the case with Saul it matters not what you have seen, heard or felt, miracle or no miracle, you are not saved and you are not going to be saved till you are baptized. Baptism is a thing that all other sinners must do just as Saul.

Baptism vs. Sprinkling

But, how was Saul baptized? He said that he was buried in baptism. He was baptized into Christ, baptized into his death, and then arose to walk in newness of life. That is God’s plan of salvation today as well as it was then. As Paul believed, repented, and was baptized, and was then converted and saved so it must be with all today.

Now, how was Saul baptized? Some say that he was sprinkled inasmuch as he was told to arise and be baptized. The Bible does not say that he arose and stood still there in his tracks and was then and there baptized. People do not need to arise to be sprinkled. And inasmuch as Paul had not eaten or drunk for three days, why not let the poor fellow, weak and sad at heart as he was, just remain seated for the few drops of water that were to be placed upon his weary head? Paul knew how he was baptized and he said that he was buried in baptism, and that explains why he was told to arise. It was necessary for him to arise in order to be baptized in water at some place, but it was not necessary to arise to be sprinkled.

Now what is Saul? He is no longer a Jew, in the Jewish church, in the Jewish religion. He has quit that for ever. This shows that a man may be called on to quit a religion and become a simple Christian. Had one religion been as good as another Paul could have stayed in the old Jewish religion. But today no church is worth anything to any man but the church of Christ, the actual church that Jesus built (Mt. 16:18) Though this land is filled with various churches man should not be a member of anything save the church of Christ, and if a man is a member of any other he must quit it forever just as Saul quit the Jewish religion and Jewish church.

Saul is now a Christian, in Christ, having put him on in baptism. He is out of everything else, and that is the only course for any one to follow today.

If one is in Christ he is one of his. All those in Christ constitute his body and his body is his church. Hence to be in Christ is to be one of his, his body, his church. No one can be in Christ without being one of Christ’s church inasmuch as his church consists of those that are in Christ and no other people. Though Paul was a very conscientious, zealous Jew in the Jewish religion, he had to make this change to become a Christian. If so in his case, my friends, you will have to quit every other church and every other religion and come to Christ and become his only, or else you can never be saved. It is worth nothing to say that you are conscientious, that you are sincere, that you think that you are right, that you are religious, that you are a member of some church; Paul was all this and more; yet he had to give up all this and become a Christian and a Christian only. So must all today. The wrong church and the wrong religion is worth no more than the wrong Christ. We must have the Christ of God, the church of Christ, the religion of the New Testament or all is lost forever.

Last summer before I accepted the work with a congregation in which there was (is) a “Premillennial” group, I talked with several older preachers about the situation, and most of them, although seemingly firm in the faith, advised me not to preach on the Kingdom question. I did not follow this advice even though it was from men older and more experienced in the work. It did not seem the Christian thing to do. I did, and continue to preach that the Kingdom of Christ is in existence and that Christ is now King and on David’s throne. Needless to say it has had its effect.

I believe that it would do the neutrals good to remember that Jesus said, “He that is not with me is against me.” Also it would help them to read Judges 5, and see what God said about Meroz. “Curse ye Meroz,” — curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof. They refused to go to the fight when God had commanded that all go. Their refusing to help the people of God was to help the enemy. We are commanded to, “Fight the good fight of faith”; “Contend earnestly for the faith.”

Are you neutral? Of what value is a soldier that will not fight? Don’t think that you can serve the Lord with one hand and the devil with the other. If you are on the Lord’s side come on to the battle lest the Lord say of you what He said of Meroz. I enjoy very much, “The Banner” and appreciate the great work that you are doing.

Charlie F. Arnett

P. S. There is no “copyright” on this, and it may be used if it is worth anything.

The true shepherd will ever be on the alert, keeping wolves from the flock. The hireling fleeth when danger approaches. We need True Shepherds in every congregation today. Yes, we need efficiency in Leadership. There should be that kindly feeling between Elders and the church that there is between the Shepherd and sheep. —Will M. Thompson
Sectarians have used the case of Cornelius with arrogant contentment in proof (?) of some of their absurd contentions. There is not a single point in the case of Cornelius that remotely resembles any of the peculiar tenets of denominational theology. With most denominationalists, conversion is a sort of convulsion—a wristical, twistical, unexplainable "whom the world cannot explain." There is not a single deviation from the known laws of nature. The miracles mentioned in this case were not conditions of salvation—they were simply incidentals. Sectarians make a great ado over these miracles; yet they are unable to reproduce or duplicate a single one of them. The first miracle was the appearance of an angel to Cornelius. The purpose was to inform him to contact an "earth vessel"—a gospel preacher—because God had placed in the hands of men the ministry of preaching the gospel. God's power to save believers (2 Cor. 4:7). The angel could not tell Cornelius what to do to be saved. The angel simply told him to send for Peter who would speak words, whereby he should be saved (Acts 11:14). Cornelius did not have the New Testament as we have it today. It is vain to expect an angel today, because we have the written word—"the perfect law of liberty." The second miracle mentioned was Peter's visitation on the house-top down at Joppa. Peter was a Jew. When God promised a blessing on repentance, and baptism in the name of Christ, are the conditions. All who are saved under the spiritual reign of Christ must comply with these conditions. A person must do something to be saved. The divine plan is "salvation by grace through faith." Grace is God's part, and faith is man's part. It is not faith only, but faith which works, as plainly stated by Paul in Galatians 5:6. When God promised a blessing on the condition of faith, that faith expressed itself in an overt act, before the blessing was received. The Pentecost of Acts 2 was the occasion of the first preaching under the great commission. A report of the preaching of the Spirit-guided apostles under the great commission is given in the Acts of the Apostles—the fifth book of the New Testament. Many cases of conversion are reported. Cornelius, an uncircumcised Gentile, is one of the cases. Upon examination of the divine record, it will be seen that all conversions were alike, that is, some were not saved one way and others saved some other way. The Lord does not have two or more ways for people to be saved or converted.

The Man

There are at least five things said about the subject of this paper. (1) He was a good man; (2) he was a devout man; (3) he gave much alms to the people; (4) he prayed to God always; and (5) he had a good report throughout the nation. Can a man with all these traits be unsaved? Well, he was unsaved (Acts 11:14). He was moral and even religious, yet he was not a citizen of Christ's kingdom—was not a Christian! A man must be "born of water and the Spirit" to be saved.

The Miracles

In Cornelius' case there are three miracles mentioned. A miracle is "a
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There are at least five things said about the subject of this paper. (1) He was a good man; (2) he was a devout man; (3) he gave much alms to the people; (4) he prayed to God always; and (5) he had a good report throughout the nation. Can a man with all these traits be unsaved? Well, he was unsaved (Acts 11:14). He was moral and even religious, yet he was not a citizen of Christ's kingdom—was not a Christian! A man must be "born of water and the Spirit" to be saved.

The Miracles

In Cornelius' case there are three miracles mentioned. A miracle is "a
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CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE GOLDEN AGE
AND RUTHERFORD

In a former article I gave the details leading up to the correspondence and the gist of the article in the marked copy of the Golden Age of January 31, 1934, which appeared on the same date of their first letter to me, plainly stating that the only people who had accepted his challenge was the Church of Christ, and he would not debate with them. While they talk in that journal of ignoring letters they had received from the Church of Christ, they could not have been referring to me for they wrote me first! The following is a copy of the first letter:

117 Adams St.
Brooklyn, N. Y.
February 1, 1934.

O. C. Lambert,
1601 Sixth Street.
Port Arthur, Texas

Dear Sir:

There has fallen into our hands a leaflet bearing your name which is entitled ‘Judge Rutherford’s Challenge Accepted!’ Of course, you know and we know that you have done nothing of the sort, at least we know that if we even know the terms of the challenge, but in order that you may be no longer in ignorance on that score we send you by this mail a copy of the Golden Age of today’s date and invite your attention to the article, ‘Seeking the Vindication of Jehovah’s Name,’ which begins on page 268. If you will read this you should be able to discern clearly that you have not accepted Judge Rutherford’s challenge and that you are not in the remotest sense qualified so to do from any point of view.

“We have not noticed in the public press any statement that the Federal Council of Churches ever selected you as a mount upon which they would ride to glory in the eyes of their fellow men. That being the case, and your selection being merely that of yourself, as set forth in your presumptuous leaflet, you would doubtless appear to them as to us and others, as the rear end of Ahasuerus’ steed, passing through the stable door after Mordecai’s ride was all over. A prune diet can be overdone.”

Sincerely,
The Golden Age

To this letter I made the following reply:

February 10, 1934
Mr. J. F. Rutherford,
117 Adams Street.
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

I now address my reply to you, I have at the same time pay my respects to an article in the Golden Age of January 31, which you sent me, and to which you refer me in your letter.

You say in the Golden Age:

“Do you suppose that is why the Catholic Church refuses to notice a debate that challenge must be either accepted or rejected.” I think (and so mean to have a debate with this body! You cannot say that you have never challenged a single religious body, for you have challenged the Catholic Church. We disbelieve your teaching just as much as the Catholic Church does. Why do you wish a debate with the Catholic Church, and not with the Church of Christ? That will be interesting to the public to hear you explain why. I strongly suspect that it is because you know the Catholic Church and not with the Church of Christ would I just try and see!

You say that you are not willing to debate with me because I selected myself. Do you suppose that is why the Catholic Church refuses to notice you? You say that you will not debate with me because I am not a part of that group called ‘The Federated Council of Churches’? It would it be imperative that I be a member of it when you are not? You may explain that you are unwilling to engage in a debate with the Church of Christ because it is not as large a body as the Catholic Church of the Federated Churches of Christ, yet the public knows that the Church of Christ outnumbers the bodies, with which you are identified many times! Do you suppose that the Federated Churches of Christ, representing approximately 50,000,000 figures that it would be a waste of time to notice a man, who, at most, represents only a few thousands? They outnumber you at least a thousand to one! Do not get excited “Judge,” the public does not take you as seriously as you take yourself.

In your letter you failed to comprehend that I challenged you! You say of your challenge to the combined clergy: “according to all rules of debate that challenge must be either accepted or rejected I think (and so does the general public) that it is cowardice that prompts a man to fail to accept a challenge. But you think the Federated Churches of Christ are cowards for failing to accept your challenge, so you ought not to censure me when I think the same thing of you!

You remember that I attended your lecture in Houston, Texas, and there made an appointment to meet you at the Rice Hotel at 5:00 p.m. I waited at the appointed place from 4:30 until 7:30, but no “Judge” showed up! Shame on you!

Again you ask in the Golden Age: “How could a debate between Judge Rutherford and any man who had accepted or rejected your challenge in the bread lines be in any way an honor to the name of Jehovah God, and how could it in any way determine the great question raised?” I suppose you mean that a poor man would be disqualified to discuss great questions. Remember Jesus had no place to lay his head and Peter said: “Silver and gold have I none.” How much money would a man have to possess to debate with your Church of Christ?

There is one other statement in The Golden Age which I wish to notice. Anyone who knows Judge Rutherford would not believe for a minute that he is a coward; but for a man who claims to be representing the Lord to resort to the Language of the street to bolster up his own prove such a man hardly competent to discuss God’s word with anybody.” Compare the foregoing with the following which is the last paragraph of the letter to which I am replying: “We have not noticed in the public press that the Federal Council of Churches ever selected you as the mount upon which they would ride to glory in the eyes of their fellow men. That being the case, and your selection being merely that of yourself, as set forth in your presumptuous leaflet, you would doubtless appear to us and others, as the rear end of Ahasuerus’ steed, passing through the stable door after Mordecai’s ride was all over. A prune diet can be overdone.”

I merely branded you as a coward, and in the light of the facts, the public will see that I have been very conservative in my language, but when it comes to being a blackguard, I must confess, you have me bested.

Very sincerely,

O. C. Lambert.

Gospel Papers have their place among us. If one brother has a right to launch a paper why not another? We need more spreading of the gospel through the printed page. We need less spreading of false theories like Premillennialism. Different people have different appetites. Personally I like corn bread, tump greens with pepper sauce. I like the truth plain and hot. I also enjoy a dessert. I don’t want to make out a full meal on the dessert alone. Some of the papers and some of our sweet-spirited brethren are going to give us dessert only. I imagine it will become nauseating indeed to the brethren after awhile. Let’s wait and see.—Will M. Thompson
Who Killed Cock Robin? -- That Brotherhood Survey

In the April Bible Banner reference was made to the so-called “brotherhood survey” published and copyrighted by one Clinton Davidson, a New York insurance man. The sweeping claim has been made that this survey was so representative of the church as to deserve “brotherhood” distinction. The promoters reported an overwhelming vote in favor of soft-pedal preaching and writing. The Christian Standard (Digerressive Organ) said the survey was taken in “an efficient and business-like manner,” as if they knew all about it. Perhaps they did. It could easily be a part of the Witty-Murch movement as well as the Clinton Copyright Davidson movement.

Some of us have thought all the time that we know the pulse and sense of “the brotherhood” well enough to know that the claims being made for this survey are too fabulous. The report, which was published in the New Christian Leader (born of this survey and destined to grow up a sissy if it does not die prematurely of its inherited anemia), claims that ninety-five percent of the answers to the questionnaires favored the views of its promoters. But it is a significant thing that they have been unwilling to reveal who answered the questionnaire. Ninety-five percent of who answered the questionnaire might be a very SMALL percent of “the brotherhood” and fall very far short of representing the sentiment of gospel preachers and faithful elders in the church. Brother Hugo McCard points out THAT DAVIDSON IS THE ONLY MAN WHO HAS SEEN THE ANSWERS TO HIS QUESTIONNAIRES. Nor do we know to whom they were sent. It is the secret of Clinton Davidson.

Since so much is being claimed for this questionnaire, which boasts of the signal accomplishment of relegating unethical preaching and journalism to the backwoods, and binding (figuratively) the men who preach and write like Jeremiah, Elijah, Paul, Peter, James, and the Lord Jesus Christ, we are entirely willing to be one of the “souls of the martyrs,” but we would just like to know before going to the block of ethical journalism for our decapitation, Who Killed Cock Robin?

This department is being turned over to the answers that have poured into our mail box, along with many other letters of encouragement assuring the editor of the Bible Banner of the confidence and affection of a great many people. Many of these letters melt our hearts and cause tears of gratitude to flow. Because of the nature of the fight that is being made against the Bible Banner and its editor we feel justified in publishing these letters. The editor’s personal fortune is insignificant, but the letters breathe a sense of honor, fairplay, loyalty to the truth and a militant love of the Cause of Christ which cannot be squelched by questionnaires nor smothered by surveys nor bewildered by bluffs. Verily, there are seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal! And if the torch of truth falls from the hand of any one leader among them, it will never hit the ground, but will be by the hand of another borne aloft. THEY SHALL NOT PASS!

My reason for not answering the “Questionnaire” put out by Clinton Davidson:

1. Mr. Davidson was unknown to me and for that reason I gave it no consideration.

2. I considered the questionnaire the product of a fanatic (pronounced fan-a-tic) who intended to do something spectacular in the field of journalism.

3. The questionnaire itself led me to believe that its author knew very little about the New Testament church, and even less about plain preaching and teaching of the truth so much in demand in these perilous times.

Yours in the faith,

Oscar Smith

* * *

The questionnaire sent out by Clinton Copyright “Sue Your Socks Off” Davidson, received the compliment of my silent contempt, because I had not learned of the return of the prodigal to usurp the journalistic throne and sway the sceptre over the writers of the brotherhood, and all of the time he had been in New York! Well, excuse my ignorance, please. Verily, it seems to me that when a prodigal returns he should wash his clothing, and take a bath, not begin selling perfume!

Keep up the fight.

Chas. M. Campbell
Evansville, Ind.

* * *

I did not receive one of the questionnaires. If I had it would have gone in the flames, just like I did the anonymous letters. I don’t believe a majority of the preachers were represented.

John Hayes
Athens, Ala.

* * *

Here is my card. I received the questionnaire and threw it into the waste basket.

B. L. Douthitt
Nashville, Tennessee.
I have just read "Who Killed Cock Robin?"—I did not. But here is my answer:

No, I did not answer the questionnaire. In fact it was several weeks after it was out before I knew anything about it. I never did see one. A preacher told me about it first and he was condemning it when he told me.

Since then I have been to many places in meetings, which has carried me to various points in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Ohio, Illinois, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas; and of all the preachers with whom I have talked, I am sure that at least 95% of them have told me they never answered it. I would really like to see the list of those who answered and what they said. If you ever get such a list put it in the Banner and then I'll be sure to read it.

I. A. Douthitt, Sedalia, Ky.

The soft copyright group did not send me one of their questionnaires. I reckon they consider me a hopeless case, and might as well for I have no intention of selling out to the devil.

The Bible Banner was red hot. Keep it going. Brother G. A. Dunn while in Montgomery gave the Bible Banner a boost.

Rex Turner, Montgomery, Ala.

Just a line to let you know that I happened to be among the number that did not "kill Cock Robin." The reason that I threw the questionnaire in the trash basket was that I felt at the time the questions were not fairly stated. They evidenced to my mind a decided bias on the part of the querist. They reminded me of such questions as "Have you quit whipping your wife?" Or "Have you quit lying?" A person cannot answer such questions as these by a 'yes' or 'no' without it being somewhat embarrassing. At the time I threw the questionnaire away I did not think so much would be made of it later or I probably would have kept it and added it to my collection of anonymous literature.

John P. Lewis, Norman, Oklahoma

I did not answer the questions sent to me by Clinton Davidson.

G. K. Wallace

Wichita, Kansas

The questions sent out by Bro. Davidson were not received, hence not answered by me.

I. C. Nance, Oklahoma City, Okla.

With regard to the journalistic thermometer, in the form of a questionnaire, circulated by Clinton Davidson; I gave it just what I give the literature I receive from the Ministerial Alliance, and the Y. M. C. A., and for about the same reasons: the waste basket.

Luther Blackmon

Houston, Texas

I did not kill Cock Robin, as I did not answer the questionnaire.

John Allen Hudson, Los Angeles, Calif.

I have been an observer for a long time how things are working. I have been familiar with the Boll theory for a long time.

I received a copy of that questionnaire letter, I did not answer it; that kind of bait doesn't catch Gospel Preachers.

Pour it on them, you are doing a good job.

B. H. Upton

Hilham, Tenn.

I did not answer the questionnaire. In all kindness I looked on it as a criticism of those who for a generation have been called on to bear the burden of pleading for New Testament things.

C. A. Norred

Fort Worth, Texas

I did not answer the "questionnaire." There are two things I never bother with; one is a vote in church matters to see where the majority stands; the other a church petition to be signed. They all have evil mixed with them.

I wondered why one would busy himself as a pope, to take a vote of the brethren of these matters; it is coming clear now, it seems that he wanted to say the "I's have it." I am sure that time will reveal this "Bush-Whacker" type that are sending these "dirty sheets" through the mail. An article that one will not sign, carries the conviction of the sender that his cause is evil.

R. L. Colley

Texarkana, Texas

If I received a copy of the Davidson questionnaire it went into the waste basket. I certainly did not answer it.

R. L. Yancey

Fort Worth, Texas

Bro. Clinton Copyright Davidson sent me one of the questionnaires to be filled out. I laid it aside as an unimportant matter. Later when I studied it, I could clearly see that it was an effort to please men and not God (Gal. 1:10). I didn't fill the thing out!

Stoy Pate, Crossville, Tenn.

Here is my card. I received the list of questions sent out by Clinton Davidson and consigned them to the waste basket without reply. I wanted to say something in reply, but I knew that only that which would serve the purpose of the promoter would be given to the public. His copyrighted article and copyrighted paper bear testimony to the correctness of my anticipation of such a movement. I venture the assertion that many more "Lovers of the Old Paths" felt as did I about the matter and perhaps replied. Would it not be interesting to know those replies and give them to the public?

It would also be interesting to know how many did not receive the questionnaire.

W. Clarence Cooke, Cookeville, Tenn.

I happen to be one of those who did not answer Clinton "Copyright's" questionnaire. Why? It must have been because I did not realize that a "Moses" had appeared to lead us into the land of better Journalism. And the reason that I failed to realize this was due to the fact that said questionnaire seemed to be lacking both in Rhyme and Reason. I prefer something more tangible, the Bible Banner is a good illustration. When I finish reading an issue of it, I usually know what it means.

Albert Smith

Lubbock, Texas

The April number of The Bible Banner is excellent. It seems to me that each issue has "nipped in the bud" the fancied theories of Boll and followers. You are doing a great work and we preachers and churches in Little Rock are behind you.

I did not sign one of the questionnaires which are sent out to see what kind of articles the brethren want. Personally, I think that is too much like sectarianism—too willing to compromise in order to get the praise of the majority.

I suppose you have a copy of the recent circular letter written by Bro. Rowe in defense of "Copyright Davidson." It sounds as if they are getting worried. Keep up your good work.

D. H. Perkins

Little Rock, Ark.
I did not answer Davidson's questionnaire regarding journalism. I was suspicious of it; something about it just made me lay it aside not to be answered.

T. M. Cummings, Littlefield, Texas.

I did not answer the Davidson questionnaire and do not think any preacher of this section did. I thought the questions were so framed as to lead the witness, and seeing the unfairness of the whole thing, I cast it into the waste basket, even after it had been filled out.

Gus Nichols, Jasper, Ala.

I am the one who threw the questionnaire into the waste basket and did not answer. My reason was that teachers should ask the Lord, and not me, what to teach. You are giving what I want in the Bible Banner. It is what our brethren need. May the Lord bless you.

A. H. Smith, Dancy, Miss.

In response to your suggestion let me say that I did not answer the questionnaire sent out by Brother Davidson. Therefore I am not one of the ninety-five per cent. I know of no one in this section who did.

W. A. Holley, Vernon, Ala.

I did not help to kill cock robin. I was not in that "ninety-five percent." I was not in that "younger and more progressive element" of which Mr. Murch spoke. (I might strain and say Brother Murch).

If Mr. Davidson wants to do any more surveying in the future I think that I will be surveyed the next time. I already have my answer ready to fill in. I pray I won't change it. Here it is: Give us more papers and preachers through which the pure and full gospel of Christ may have free course. Let us all accept Paul's charge to Timothy in its fullness: "Reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine," for the time has come when Davidson, Murch and the others of the "ninety-five percent" in Murch's report will not endure sound doctrine.

I appreciate the stand that you and others in the Bible Banner are taking. You are sure to win. You are winning.

C. C. Burns Florence, Ala.

The Bible Banner came today. I enjoy every issue. I received one of Davidson's questionnaires but did not answer it. I threw it in the waste basket for various reasons. When it was received it struck me about the same way the circular letter sent out from Philadelphia, and signed "A. Christian Young" did, which was altogether in an unfavorable light. I had never heard of Clinton Davidson in connection with the work of the church, and since for most of my life I have read some of the papers published by members of the church of Christ, and because of the nature of the questions, I was led to suppose that he must be of that group of compromisers opposed to opposing error in and out of the church; of that group opposed to those who are opposing and exposing the teachers of error and their error. For these reasons I did not answer the questionnaire, and if I had answered they would not have suited the result as given in the copyrighted conclusions.

Had you been foreseeing (?) enough to have copyrighted all of your writings, and to have employed "eminent legal counsel" as your advisors, you might have forestalled the possibility of having men take advantage of your articles by quoting only part of them instead of the entire article. Then they would not have been twisted out of their true meaning either. But when people intend to do this with other men's writings they would naturally think some one would do their writings that way. Their motto seems to be: "We will do to others what we will keep others from doing to us by copyright." They seem to be followers of Confucius, or nearer so, than of Christ. But what would happen to this group of copyrighters if all of the periodicals of years past edited and published by members of the church of Christ had been copyrighted? For I see parts of articles of other religious journals copied in the copyright paper.

I like your motto: "They shall not pass." When men (?) who write slanderous articles on one's character, when they cannot meet his arguments, and are too cowardly to sign their names to what they write, I am persuaded that a mighty host is ready to join in seeing that this motto is sustained.

Sincerely yours,

Luther G. Roberts, Amarillo, Texas.

Edcouch, Texas

April 4, 1939

In answer to your suggestion to find out who DID NOT receive the Clinton Davidson questionnaire among the preachers I quickly respond that I did not.

I am intimately acquainted with the preaching brethren of the Valley. To my knowledge none of the 15 received a copy of that questionnaire.

Will say that you have many staunch supporters, endorsers, and defenders in your (and our) fight against the encroachments of the premillennial heresy. I speak particularly of the Valley churches.

You recall your suggestion made some months back regarding the idea that if all churches would get rid of their Great Songs Of The Church song book and never buy any more, the premillennial organization would go bankrupt. I carried the suggestion to every church in the Valley and fought for it to be carried out. The result was that this book is no longer in use by any Valley church although it was being used prior to that time. I read with much interest your attacks on this new "copyright" idea. Am particularly thankful that you do not copyright your writings because I am able to spread them so much farther. Together with the Edcouch church I helped distribute 200 copies of your new tract—"What Is The Church of Christ." Furthermore am running it serially in the Valley-wide paper I put out every week-Christian Soldier.

Ira Y. Rice, Edcouch, Tex.

I am one who did not answer Brother Clinton Davidson's questionnaire. My reasons for not doing so were: (1) I knew nothing of the one who sent it; (2) the ultimate purpose for gathering the requested information was not stated; (3) no good reason for such a questionnaire was apparent to me; and (4) knowing that there were some among us who were seeking to squash the discussion of certain issues I felt needed further discussion, I was reluctant to aid any move I thought might have that as its goal. So, knowing what disposition was to be made of the information asked for, I laid the questionnaire, along with the inquiry concerning experienced journalists, aside without further consideration.

Cecil N. Wright, McAlester, Okla.

Copyright Davidson did not send me one of his questionnaires to ascertain what the brotherhood wanted in the way of journalism. I presume I do not belong to his brotherhood. Keep up the fight; right will win.

Will M. Thompson, Holdenville, Okla.
Just a word about the paper. I am sure I have seen nothing among us that is quite as fine as The Bible Banner. I am for you whole heartedly. Just as long as you continue with the paper as it is now, you may keep my name on the subscriber’s list. I am continually receiving slanderous matter concerning you, but since the fellows who write it are too cowardly to sign their names, what they say means nothing to me. The time will come when these “under cover” thugs will be uncovered. Keep up the fight. We need what you are doing along teaching lines.

As to the questionnaire sent out by Davidson, I received one of them, read it, and pitched it in the waste basket. It was evident to me that nothing good for the truth could come from his findings. I am of the opinion that more of them were replied to by drossives than of the church. I have never found a preacher among us that filled it out.

Yours in the fight for truth,
Glenn A. Parks,
Clovis, N. M.

I received at least two questionnaires. Looked them over, got a big laugh out of them and then put them in the stove and forgot about them. I have no time for a coward. I hope those fellows sign their names and give us a chance. May the Lord bless you in the Christian army.

Tillman Prince,
Springfield, Mo.

I hardly remember receiving a questionnaire from Clinton Davidson. As well as I remember it, the post office waste basket got it, where I put all circular trash I get in the mails. I wish these anonymous writers would take me off their list. I will not believe what a man writes unless he signs his name, and I’m too busy to read such trash as they put out.

Yours in the battle line,
Harvey Childress,
Midland, Texas.

I have just finished reading the current issue of the Bible Banner and like the ring of truth it carries. No indeed, I did not give answer to the questionnaire nor would, for I left such when I came out of the Christian church. I say continue to “pour it on them.” When men resort to underhand methods that is the best evidence possible that they are down. Your punches are more than they can stand. Their end is near. Yours for the Cause of Christ.

Joe H. Morris,
Huntington, West Va.

Yes, I received one of the now famous questionnaires and liked it so much that I put it in the waste basket for safe keeping. I never did like “mail order” journalism, anyway. Just another not of the ninety-five percent.

Joe Hunter,
Douglass, Kan.

Just reading my copy of the Bible Banner. Sure have enjoyed every issue. I noticed in “Who Killed Cock Robin” you wanted names of those who did not answer the questions of the “lost boy.” I received the questions but did not answer them. Why? Anyone with one eye could see there was something shady about them.

Cleon Lyles,
Muskogee, Okla.

I did not answer the questionnaire sent out by Clinton Davidson because I did not care what kind of religious journalism the brotherhood wanted. I know what kind they need, and have been doing my little mite to give it to them for many years (without protection of copyright). I had been an occasional contributor to the Leader in times past, but discontinued both contributions and subscriptions following the copyright. If I am able to write anything of value to the cause, I am willing for it to be used anywhere it will do for good. Yours for gospel journalism.

James T. Amis,
Springfield, Mo.

Today I received a copy of a seven page article on “Facts Free From Opinions” by “a friend of Abilene Christian College.” Now, if I had a friend with such a soiree as this one has I would want him to play shut mouth. Brother J. Roy Vaughn and I have talked it over and we have an opinion as to who is behind such but do not know. You could find out who wrote the Head of Charter Division of Texas on Dec. 14, 1938, for the information they received—then publish his name and challenge him to deny it. Such unscrupulous men should be brought face to face with the facts.

Even though you did not get to incorporate, I am unable to see where you have failed to give the public all they could expect for their money. But that is the trouble now—you have given them too much truth for some of those Clinton Davidson tyne of fellows. Give them the facts in the soire of love and meekness is all that I have to say.

H. C. Winnett,
Miami, Fla.

What? The questionnaire? Reason; it just had a sectarian ring that was too cheap to be genuine. Sound like some denominationalist preacher feeling the pulse of his church for his next Sunday’s sermon.

Robert E. Gulley,
Guthrie, Okla.

This is to inform you that I received a questionnaire and that it appeared to me to be a sort of a vote and I gave it a good letting alone, as I had seen enough voting on religious questions. And if voting upon what sort of teaching should be done to disciples through “our papers” is to be the order, why not let the alien sinner vote on what sort of preaching he is to hear when and if he attends church services?

J. A. Thrasher,
Bloomington, Ind.

My copy of the Davidson questionnaire went the way of nearly every gospel preacher’s copy (I predict)—into the nearest waste basket. I read it well enough, but could not reason out any basis for doing good by answering Davidson’s questions. Since that time I have consigned to the same end several “yellow sheets” in the form of anonymous letters. I plead “not guilty” in the “Cock Robin” murder case. If I had signed, however, the percentage who “favor their views” would have been ninety-four and a fraction, or less.

W. Levi Gentry,
Plant City, Fla.

There is no doubt but that you are giving the brothervi the best paper of all. Your faith, courage and zeal should be appreciated and admired by all lovers of truth. In spite of all efforts to crush you, you are growing stronger all the time. No one that knows you has any fear of your giving up the fight. You are not made of that kind of stuff. I am praying for you, and backing you up in every way I can. May God bless you, dear brother.

C. B. Thomas,
Shidler, Okla.

Your favor at hand and appreciated. I feel that the Bible Banner has a distinctive and important field, and also believe the Worker has its part to perform.

We all appreciate your ability. I would as leave risk the cause in your hands as any man I know in the brotherhood. Success to you.

Homer E. Moore
Editor Christian Worker
 Wichita, Kansas
I did not sign and return Clinton Davidson’s questionnaire that he sent to the preachers. I thought at the time I received it, that it was a bit of foolishness. I am predicting that he will learn more from experience about Journalism, than he learned from his “inside information.” Make the Bible Banner bigger and better and hotter.

Loyd L. Smith
Fresno, Calif.

I got one of the Davidson questionnaires. I had never heard of him, had no idea what would grow out of the thing, paid very little attention to it, and of course thinking thus of it I did not answer. I just dismissed it from my mind with the idea that it was from some crank.

I am reading the Bible Banner with pleasure.

Allen Phy
Glasgow, Ky.

The questionnaire sent by Bro. Davidson was not signed by this scribe. His journalism is not the type that I like nor indorse. Long live the Bible Banner.

Wallace W. Thompson,
Fresno, Calif.

I did not answer the questionnaire from Clinton Davidson because of the catchy, unfair, and misleading phraseology of the questions. They looked like darts aimed at someone, or some papers-from the dark. Again the very wording seemed to throw discredit on those old soldiers of the cross who have been preaching, writing and teaching the truth all these many years. Again when I first read the questionnaire and accompanying literature, I thought perhaps someone was trying to sell me something—perhaps a course in journalism.

Keep up the fight, and if anyone tells you that “premillennialism” is not being taught out in California—well, they just don’t know, or they are trying to hide the facts. When I have time perhaps I can give you some of the facts.

Lloyd E. Ellis
Daly City, Calif.

I have received the April issue of Bible Banner and I think I have read every line in it. I believe it is one of the best issues you have put out. I am with you one hundred per cent in your fight against the Boll speculations and all other forms of false doctrine.

I reckon I am not counted with the “young and progressive preachers of the conservative group” according to Bro. Murch, for I didn’t help kill “Cock Robin.” Yes, I received one of the questionnaires but consigned it to the waste basket as most other preachers did. It would be interesting to me to learn how Bro. Murch knows just who returned the questionnaire, whether they were “young and progressive” or not.

Hope you and your family are well. We are O. K.

Thomas J. Wagner
Hopkinsville, Ky.

More and more I see the need of the Bible Banner. I am right with you in the fight to keep the church pure. A wave of digression is rolling over the brotherhood, and I fear that many will be swept away.

D. H. Hadwin
Belpre, Ohio

The Bible Banner for April received. I pronounce it fine concerning that questionnaire sent out by Clinton Davidson. I received a copy but made no response as requested. I do not endorse that sort of procedure. I also received that latest anonymous circular “Facts free from Opinions” by a friend of A. C. C. I destroyed it as I do not believe the so-called “facts.”

Thos. J. Shaw
Commodore, Pa.

I recall having received one such letter which was addressed with “Rev.” so I put it in the trash basket. Soon I got a card saying the “Rev.” should not have been there.

The Bible Banner is the “minute-man” of the time. We younger contenders take courage to wage the fight. Keep going.

Buford Holt,
Corpus Christi, Texas

This is to advise that I received one of the Davidson questionnaires, but did not answer it.

Otha D. Fikes
Donna, Texas

Here comes my card in regard to Clinton Copyright Davidson’s survey. I received a letter from him to that effect. It was addressed “Rev.” Leslie L. Spear. I glanced over it and gently cast it in the waste basket. A few days later I received a card explaining why it was addressed “Rev.” You ask that we drop a card, but I can’t out all I want to say on a card so I’m writing a letter.

Leslie L. Spear
Dearborn, Mich.

I glory in your spunk in your fight for a pure gospel. I am trying to get my friends to subscribe.

Dr. C. M. Yater
Fort Worth, Texas

The April issue of the Bible Banner came yesterday. In my humble judgment it definitely fills a definite need in the church today. I appreciate its uncompromising stand for the truth, and pledge my support to its program. The sound spanking that is being administered to Clinton Copyright Davidson, Premillennialism and all the other isms of this age is, in my opinion, the only effective remedy for such. “Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching” is the divine injunction. Keep the good work going, and may nothing hinder your efforts is my prayer.

Fraternally,
Albert Smith,
Lubbock, Texas.

I did not see that scurrilous effusion by the self appraised friend of A. C. C. until last night, though it had been mailed to a few members here and I heard that a package had been sent to Central to be handed out to members . . . . I believe that God will overrule all such to the good of all who are true to their trust, as I am sure you are. I saw your mention of it in the last issue of the Banner and the promise that a further statement is coming in the next. I agree that you should state the facts as fully and emphatically as you can, but believe that one should retaliate as little as possible. I realize that the temptation is great and do not know that I would be able to “yield not” but believe that you are big enough not to yield.

W. A. Phillips, Elder,
Central Church of Christ,
Los Angeles, Calif.

No doubt you have received information of another anonymous letter that is being circulated. I believe that every honest, thinking Christian has such contempt for a cowardly, anonymous letter writer, that I do not believe the letter will do much harm here, except to encourage cowards and enemies of the truth. For a man who has convictions, and who stands by them, I have respect, even tho I cannot agree with him, but for the man who is either afraid or ashamed to sign his name to a letter that he mails out, I cannot have any respect.

J. C. Shacklett,
Nashville, Tenn.
The April number of the Banner came to me today. It is exceedingly fine. There is not a preacher living whose work I appreciate more than I do yours. For many years I have been a close observer of your work, the attacks, and the counter attacks, and it is my sincere conviction that the brethren of the future will give your work the recognition it so justly deserves.

Any insinuation that your fight against premillennialism was actuated by a desire for public acclaim is as absurd to those who know you as an insinuation that you are a miser. Anyone who thinks that a love of money or publicity ever governed you in a single deed just doesn't know Foy “Esco” Wallace, Jr.

I want you to know that my sympathy and influence are with you and the Banner. When I can be of any help to you and the Banner in this section, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely and fraternally,
Cecil B. Douthitt
Louisville, Ky.

Mr. Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
c/o R. L. Colley
Texarkana, Ark.

Dear Foy:

The ones who promote the sending of the scurrilous matter through the country, unsigned, have less wisdom than the compositions indicate. All such “knocks are boosts.” They but serve to draw lines deeper between false teaching and truth. One is never thoroughly mean till he becomes a religious partisan—an exponent of false doctrine.

He who signed himself “A Friend of Abilene Christian College” doubtless thought he was doing the school a real service by his circular; but were I at the head of the school I would try to dissuade him or others from trying to show friendship by such productions. Such circulars cause one to raise the question: Is the party an ex-student of ACC? Did he learn while in that school to make such insinuations, charges, etc., as his circular contained? Is that the spirit promoted by the school? I think not, yet it makes one wonder.

C. R. Nichol,
Seminole, Okla.

20 Garden St. Chisholm
Montgomery, Ala.
March 22, 1939

Dear Bro. Wallace,

I received the last anonymous letter yesterday. As you know, this one was sent from Atlanta, Ga., and signed “A friend of Abilene Christian College.” I think another postmark and signature would have been more appropriate.

This letter is both disgusting and amusing. The statement regarding 22% of the issues of the Gospel Guardian being fewer than 5000 in number is really laughable.

A man who would write such a letter is nefariously wicked, and were he not such a coward to take one’s life.

You are striking the right note; keep playing it. Your blows, though well above the belt, are dealing the premillenialist and their sympathizers and the colleges plenty of misery. These unsigned letters show you have them against the ropes. Keep slugging.

Either of the above evils is bad enough, but when they combine it is time some one call a halt as you are doing. Though I graduated from both D. Lipscomb and Harding, I hold no brief for any Bible college when it leaves the only possible grounds justifying its existence. I had rather see every one of them close their doors than have them dominate the church, corrupt its teaching and lower the standard of Christian living. We have enough worldliness without those who claim to stress the spiritual setting the example for us.

Sincerely yours,
Leonard Johnson
Montgomery, Ala.

spent last night with J. D. Tant in his home at Los Fresnos. Discussing the brotherhood at large, “the papers” occupied a considerable portion of our conversation.

You may be interested in knowing we both heartily endorse your stand and policy on the Banner and consider your paper as accomplishing more for pure and undefiled New Testament Christianity than any other paper or single agency in the brotherhood. Keep on fighting.

Ira Rice
Edcouch, Texas

I am a new reader of The Bible Banner and enjoy it very much. I was a member of the Christian church for 35 years but left that group last spring to become a member of the body of Christ which I was taught that I had been all of those years. The Church of Christ is so much different than the man made institutions which claim to be able to save a man’s soul. I read the Christian Standard for a number of years but never got what my heart really needed, I was handed a copy of the Gospel Advocate and the Bible Banner and decided they were the papers I should have to help me get acquainted with the church of Christ. I have enjoyed both of them very much and I am convinced that every Christian should take a religious journal.

May God bless you in your good work in correcting error practiced by so many folks.

L. M. Seid,
Sheridan, Wyo.

I am enclosing a circular sheet received in today’s mail from some “Bollite” in Tulsa, Okla. You may have seen others like it already: if not this will “wize” you up on their latest activities.

It is my suspicion that the mailing lists of the Christian Leader is being sown down with this propaganda, since they must have obtained my name and address that way. You will note that they do not even refer one time to the Leader for support, but manufacture it all from the Gospel Advocate. This in itself, is an indication to me that Davidson is behind this sheet-else why would not Word and Work claim some of the real sympathy that is to be found in the Leader? ... They want the average church member over the land to believe that the Gospel Advocate is not against Bollism-disarming hostility to Bollism thereby, and paving the way for a favorable reception of an open alliance between the Leader and Boll.

I get most all the publications of the Brotherhood and think the Bible Banner the best and most needed of them all. (I got two subscriptions for it here, just recently). Your stand for the truth against error is greatly appreciated by me and with all those who have seen the Banner (with whom I have talked) ... We do not want Bollism fed to us under the guise of “ethical journalism,” and I hope few elsewhere will be misled by them.

A. H. Tate
Barstow, Texas

515 S. Winnetka St.
April 5, 1939.

The Banner reached me yesterday. I like it. I see that you have not weakened. I hope that the full situation may be revealed and seen by all those that wish to know the situation.

May God’s guidance and blessings be with you in all things.

Truly, your friend and brother,
G. A. Dunn
Dallas, Tex.
There and Here

HUGO MCORD

Some of us are criticized for engaging in “personalities.” Those who condemn me for it likewise engage in personalities — behind backs and in private talks; we do it in the papers, when we think a brother needs rebuking before all that others may fear. I still think the latter way in much more manful. “But, Hugo, who appointed you a rebuker of brethren?” Why, we are all our brothers’ keepers; besides who appointed you a rebuker of me?

It would be much easier for me just to sit at home and not engage in the fight against the Boll schism. It would be more pleasant for me, and I would not be considered narrow and an extremist. But, brethren, I think the fight is just as much my responsibility as it is Foy Wallace’s. It is not his fight; if we have the truth, it is the Lord’s fight—a mortal combat between truth and error. And I for one am not going to sit at home, read the papers, talk to visitors about it, and not get in the scrap myself. In that situation, I’d be a spectator, not a Christian soldier. No, it is not that I approve everything in Foy Wallace. I have not seen the man yet whom I felt safe in following all the way. But we all know Foy Wallace has stood for the truth and nothing but the truth on this proposition, and I am derelict in my duty if I do not do my little bit in helping him wage a strong battle.

In my poor judgment, worldliness is the greatest evil in the church today. On that subject I preach much more than against any other error among brethren. But the fact remains that premillennialism is a major issue today, among denominations and in the church. It has split the body of our Lord. Yet some brethren rather boast of their ignorance of the whole thing.

Bro. Clinton Davidson told me recently, “Nearly all the articles I read from you are negative and critical of somebody; write something constructive.” Bro. Davidson was being “negative and critical of somebody” when he gave that advice. Nearly all the articles I write are for papers mostly directed to church members; hence I try to write what we church members need. Should I write for the Truth in Love (of growing and deserved praise), which is directed altogether to non-church members, I’d write different articles. For us as church members, including Bro. Davidson, it would be well to keep in mind the commission given to Jeremiah by the Almighty (Jeremiah 1:10). Of the six items, four were negative, two positive.

Bro. McMillan recently featured an article in the Christian Leader featuring Clinton Davidson as a student in Potter Bible College, under James A. Harding, and how he later made a great success in the insurance business leading the whole world in insurance sales. He tells how he afterward formed an investment company of his own to handle thousands of dollars for rich people — and then relates that Bro. Davidson once lived in Louisville, Kentucky and attended services where M. C. Kurfees labored and heard him preach. He added that he now belongs to the Church of Christ in New York City.

A glowing tribute! But how misleading to Leader readers. One would think Bro. Davidson had been a model Christian through the years! I know Bro. McMillan meant well, but how he could hide the following vital facts I do not know: 1. After a conference with Bro. Kurfees, Bro. Davidson’s “sympathies were with Boll.” (Davidson’s words) 2. When Bro. Davidson returned to Louisville from Sellersburg, Indiana, he did not go to “the congregation where Bro. M. C. Kurfees preached” but went to “the congregation where” E. L. Jorgenson preached. 3. When Bro. Davidson moved to Buffalo, New York, he worshipped with the digressive church, and helped that church start another digressive church in Buffalo. 4. When Bro. Davidson went to New York City he went first to the loyal church, did not like it as it was, and went to a digressive church on Eighty-first Street and became superintendent of its Sunday School. Only recently has he been considered a member of the “New York City Church of Christ.”

Bro. McMillan knew the above items, for I had sent them to him and asked him to publish them himself so that Leader readers could never think that the Leader endorses the life of the man who has renovated it.

Let no one think I am an enemy of Bro. Davidson. I am his friend. If he has repented of his past life every Christian will rejoice. He is not convinced yet though that he did wrong in worshipping with the instruments; he contends he was worshipping in his heart and was privately teaching the instruments wrong. I asked, “What good would your teaching do if you said to the digressives, ‘You are wrong to have instruments, but I’ll take part in the worship with you’?” Answer of Bro. Davidson: “I would not state it that way.” Thus, in my estimation, he failed to answer the point. He thinks instruments are wrong, but he can worship with them anyway! Such is hard for me to understand. And instead of a clean admission of error in the matter, he tried to defend himself by saying mechanical music is no worse than modernism which was at the “loyal” church. But even so, that would not make mechanical music right, and besides, there was rank modernism where he went.

Bro. Davidson promised me he would resudy instrumental music on the point of a Christian worshipping with digressives and teaching them. (Doing evil that good may come.) I am eager to learn the results of his study, for if he is as sincere and reverential as he seems to be, he will soon make a clear statement of his error through the years. He has objected to instrumental music only in theory, not in practice.

Bro. Davidson keeps urging that he is not a public man in the church—that he is not an elder; and that he is not an editor or director of the new Leader. For the eoid of the church, it is an excellent thing he has no official position; a man who has been as weak against the digressives as he has no business being a public leader; a man who acknowledges he knows nothing of premillennialism (does not know whether it should be taught or not) is surely not ready to be a watchman on Zion’s walls.

Though he has no official position, he is a public man, and is exerting more influence than many with “official” positions. Being the one who sent the questionable questionnaire, being the only one who has seen the returns, being the one who bought the Leader, being one who is now writing for the Leader, it is quite satisfactory for him to say: “The papers should not think of me and write of me; I have no official position; I’m just an individual.” He is a public man and public men are public property and must not be surprised if they are scrutinized.
Questions Asked E. W. McMillan
J. L. HINES

1. Do you recognize Brethren N. B. Hardeman and Foy E. Wallace, Jr., as the leading brethren in the fight against Premillennialism?

2. Have you heard that there is a movement on foot to destroy certain preachers, namely: N. B. Hardeman, Foy E. Wallace, John T. Lewis, E. R. Harper, R. L. Whiteside and C. R. Nichol?

3. Is it a fact that on July 5, 1938, the elders and deacons of the Central church, of Nashville, Tennessee (where you preach) adopted the following resolution: "Moved and seconded, that there be no announcement made in regard to, or about the Hardeman meeting, to be held in the Dixie Tabernacle on Fatherland Street in October, 1938, sponsored by the Eleventh Street Church of Christ, by Brother McMillan or any officer of the Central Church of Christ." And did not all the elders and deacons vote for that resolution, except Elder C. E. W. Dorris and Deacon B. H. Murphy?

4. Did you announce from the pulpit of the Central Church, and over the radio WLAC, September 11th, 1938 that E. H. Hoover, a known Bollite, would begin a meeting at Woodbury, Tennessee, the next Sunday?

5. Did you refrain from announcing the Hardeman meeting because of the action of "your" elders, and announce the Hoover meeting because they asked you to so do,-did you have no personal convictions in the matter?

6. Why did you arrange to be away from Nashville during the Hardeman meeting?

7. Do you know that S. H. Hall, minister of the Russell Street church, Nashville, and one of the directors of David Lipscomb College, worked publicly and over the telephone and from house to house against the Hardeman meeting, and that he, too, was away from the city at the time of the Hardeman meeting?

8. Did you not believe, with others in Nashville, that N. B. Hardeman was coming to Nashville for the purpose of exposing "Bollism" in the churches of Nashville and in David Lipscomb College, and do you not believe that that is the real cause for the opposition of said meeting?

9. Did not Clinton Davidson try to purchase the Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation, the Christian Leader and some other papers, with a view to merging them into One Paper, under one name, copyright the paper, and thereby destroy the ancient landmarks: the Advocate and Firm Foundation and compel the "brotherhood" to submit to dictatorial power forced upon it because of the illegal use of money in the hands of a fifteen year hide-out?

10. Is it not a fact that Clinton Davidson while living in Louisville, although a member of the "church where M. C. Kurfees preached" gave his influence to R. H. Boll?

11. Where has this man Davidson been for the last fifteen years?

12. How many questionaries did Clinton Davidson send out to the brethren?

13. How many questionaries did Clinton Davidson receive an answer to?

NOTE: I explained that I meant copies-J. L. H.

14. Why is the "Christian Leader" copyrighted? Is it because said Davidson does not have confidence in his brethren?

15. Is it a fact that you, S. H. Hall and G. C. Brewer (conservatives) have launched out on a program, that you believe will bring about a better feeling between the "radicals" and the "luberals" among "us"?

16. Is it the policy of the Christian Leader to commend to the reading public the Gospel Advocate and Firm Foundation? If so, just what is the mission of the Leader?

17. Will the Leader use such men as, D. H. Friend, H. L. Olmstead, Willis Allen, E. H. Hoover, Frank M. Mullins, J. E. Blansett, Chas. Neal or other Boll sympathizers?

18. Will the Leader use such men as, Foy E. Wallace, Jr.; N. B. Hardeman, John T. Lewis, E. R. Harper, Cled Wallace and other men of the "Hit-straight" type?

19. Is it not a fact that the Leader expects to use only the type who will not touch on issues after the "sledgehammer" fashion?

J. L. Hines, 611 S. Mont Clair, Dallas, Texas. (Note: I would like to see the answers to these questions by Brother McMillan in the Christian Leader—Editor)

The Lunatic Fringe
FLOYD A. DECKER

The Christian Standard, a few weeks ago, published an article by James DeForest (Unity) Murch, concerning the relative faithfulness of publications of both the "Christian Churches" and brethren of the church of Christ. In a chart illustration accompanying the article he placed the Christian Century, an ultra modern publication of the Christian Church, on the left, and the Bible Banner, a paper published in defense of the faith, on the extreme right. Beginning on the left with white to include all the ultra moderns the chart was gradually shaded until it was entirely black in the space occupied by the Bible Banner, white nor black but just a general grey. The Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation and the Christian Leader he placed in deeper shading than the Christian Standard but not so dark as the Bible Banner, with the Christian Leader running second to the Christian Standard in its middle-of-the-road policy. All who amounted to anything in the estimation of brother Murch were in the sections neither white nor black. The right and left extremes were by Murch termed "black." When I read the article I thought of a statement of the Lord: "I know the works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I Would Thou Wert Cold Or Hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth" (Rev. 3:16). Yes, neither black nor white but general grey and trying to play both ends against the middle, standing for nothing but what an imagined majority stands for. Afraid to stand out in the open for truth!

The fact that Brother Murch under estimates the strength of the "lunatic fringe," and thinks he is about to make a great coup through the few weak brethren who have appointed themselves to the last work of Judas and his flatter as appeared a week or two before, cause me to write this in order to go on record as belonging to the fringe on the right. I am not a writer and because I am not I have hesitated to write. But I want Foy Esco Wallace, Jr., to know that I am with him, and all associated with him, in this fight to save the church from whatever danger may threaten the cause for which Jesus died. I want to apologize to brother Wallace and to all concerned for not having spoken before. I have thought that brother Wallace used bad judgement on a few occasions in his fight for truth but I find he is always right finally.
And while he is not perfect, his fight is for the truth and the church for which Jesus gave his life. If I have ever been criticized in my stand for truth, by those who love the truth, I have never found it out. I have simply failed to speak out in the press as I should have.

Brother Witty if you want to consummate your unity movement and bring the Christian Church and the church of the Lord together as they were a century ago, I have a little advice for you. I preached for that group for seven years or more and I know whereof I speak. Here it is: Get them to give up the Instrumental Music and organizational machinery, their unscriptural ideas and preaching concerning the earthly reign of Christ, their women preachers, their unscriptural ways and means of raising money and their cooperation with their denominational brethren, have them quit calling their preachers revivalist preacher, reverend and doctor, have them quit their special day observances, for many of them observe as many special days as the Catholic Church ever did, including Lent, Palm Sunday and Easter, and then you may be in a position to talk to them about giving up the rest of their ungodliness and adding the things of God's world which they for years have left off. Be frank with them and tell them straight out what the Lord expects. We are right there where they left us back in the sixties. Now if you want to be a modern Jeroboam and cause "Israel to sin" and if you want us to lose our identity as the ten tribes did you may manifest that desire by continuing as you are with your silly conferences. But I warn you, it will not be an easy job, for I am convinced that the cause for which we fight is of God and can't be destroyed. The "lunatic fringe" when the test comes will prove to your pious amazement to be just about the "whole cloth." Yes, you might split the church but I venture this: The side of the split you get won't be big enough to make enough toothpicks to pass around after one of your conference picnics.

Yes brethren, put me down as belonging to the "lunatic fringe," not on the left with the goats of modernism but on the right with the sheep of God's pasture. "Because thou art lukewarm, I will spue thee out."

My prayers and best wishes are always with you. Hurrah! for the Bible Banner-the paper with a backbone!

George W. DeHoff
Lepanto, Ark.

We Can't Teach Them
THOS. G. BUTLER

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. 28:19-20.) A person would have to some help to misunderstand this passage of Scripture.

All nations must be taught, and this responsibility rests directly upon the church. "To the intent that now unto A he and New Testament work in one place were projected on the screen. It was all exceedingly interesting, but there were three pictures that commanded special attention. There was the "missionary's" home, a beautiful white bungalow surrounded with verdant plants and variegated flowers. Adjacent to the home was the meeting house for the church. It was simple but adequate, better than the house in which the lecture was being given. In group the membership of about fifty members were pictured on the screen. The home, the meeting house, and the equipment were owned by the church, no debt. There was a membership of about fifty to preach the gospel in that land, but funds were being solicited to help this congregation. This situation is comparable to work in other foreign fields.

The question was asked the speak- "Is this congregation self-supporting?" That was a fair question because the church owned a home for the "missionary" and a meeting house. The climax of this article was the reply made to the question. The reply was, "We can't teach them." Thinking of the great commission, the reply seemed incongruous for the commission says "to teach them- all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Paul states, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." (1 Cor. 14:37.) Again he wrote, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." (1 Cor. 16:2.) The church at Corinth was a new church in a foreign field; yet, Paul taught them to give not only for the work in Corinth but also to help the poor saints in Jerusalem. "Paul said, "Just as soon as a person is baptized into Christ he should be taught to give a portion of his income to the work of the Lord, whether he lives in Japan, Tennessee, or Florida. He said "We can't teach them." The New Testament says, "teach them all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Let no one say that I am opposed to preaching the gospel to those in foreign countries, and supporting those who go because I am not; but I am opposed to a "one man missionary society," and sending men to preach the gospel who can not fulfill the demands of the great commission.
Embrey-Sherrell Debate

R. L. COLLEY

This debate was held in Texarkana, the first night in the "Municipal Auditorium." All the other sessions were held in the Dudley Avenue Church of Christ Building, except the last day and a part of the night session. Beginning March the 28th and continuing through to the night of the 31st. The propositions discussed were: "The scriptures teach that the kingdom of Jesus Christ, was established (or set up), on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus from the dead." C. L. Embrey affirming and W. E. Sherrell denying. "The scriptures teach that all of God's children saved by the blood of Jesus will finally reach heaven." C. L. Embrey affirming, and W. E. Sherrell denying. "The scriptures teach that baptism to a penitent believer is in place of usefulness in such service; but since it takes so much time to grow them I am afraid we would be most out of date before they get around." W. E. Sherrell affirming, and C. L. Embrey denying. "The scriptures teach that baptism to a penitent believer is in order to secure the forgiveness of past alien sins." C. L. Embrey affirming, and W. E. Sherrell denying.

It would take more space to give the arguments than I shall ask the paper to print. Permit me to say, that in my judgment, this was a great victory for the truth. The challenge came from Mr. Sherrell, through Mr. Chastine, pastor of the County Avenue Baptist Church, as a challenge to the County Avenue Baptist Church. The reasons for the Baptist going all this round about way to challenge the Dudley Avenue Church of Christ, when both of the Churches were here in the same town: while Mr. Sherrell lives in Benton, Arkansas, would be explained in saying, that is just another strange action of their faith with the Church of Christ preachers, with either boys or men. I would suggest that they plant some more "debater seed" if it did not take so long for them to grow to the place of usefulness in such service; but since it takes so much time to grow them I am afraid we would be most out of date before they get around.

In my judgment, the Baptists have many debaters that can represent them better than Mr. Sherrell did in this debate. It seemed that he has become skillful in misquoting scriptures to make them say what he wanted them to say, as he did that very thing all along through the debate. And he seemed to make no effort to correct the error when his attention was called to the fact. I consider him a very poor debater.

Brother Embrey was master of the proposition for which he contended, and his arguments made that very evident throughout the debate. He pressed Mr. Sherrell very hard. I think, on most of the propositions, as much as I have ever heard. When they came to the last proposition (baptism), as affirmed by Brother Embrey, Mr. Sherrell seeming to be well worn and somewhat irritable. It seemed that Brother Embrey offered a different line of arguments from what he expected, and he was not equal to the task before him. He complained at the arguments, and said they were not believed by the Church of Christ neole; and finally, asked Brother Embrey why he d'd not introduce Act 2:38?

On the third day of the debate, the Baptist people said that they had people at the County Avenue Baptist Church that wanted to hear the debate, and could not come to the Dudley Avenue Church of Christ, as they had no way to come: and they asked to have the debate at the Baptist Church the last night. When I was consulted as to the wisdom of the change, I said that it was not my judgment that the place should be changed. So did Sherrell Embrey. One of the deacons of the Baptist Church and the pastor, Chastine, assured us that there was no motive other than to give opportunity to those who could not come, a chance to hear. This assurance was questionable to me then, and is yet; notwithstanding we went out there to the County Avenue Baptist Church (which is out at the edge of town); and they did not treat us with respect. Sherrell made charges on Brother Embrey that were not fit for respectable people to listen to, and we were not equal to the debate then. Sherrell said that a charge of the character of Brother Embrey's mother, sister and himself. Brother Embrey demanded of him to retract the statement, but he refused. As a moderator, I called on Mr. Chastine, Sherrell's moderator and the pastor of the Baptist Church, and he said "just forget it and go on with the debate." I told him that we would not permit the church to listen to any such dishonorable talk, and that if he did not retract the statement, we would close the debate then. Sherrell said "had never apologized" to one of us, and that he "would never do it." As a moderator I dismissed the debate, and believe yet, that it was the right thing to do. I saw no need to call upon a crowd of people to listen to such abusive talk in the name of an honorable controversy. Most of all people arose and passed out, when Elder Sherrell saw that it was dismissed, he tried to make what he called an announcement, but began talking about the debate, and the people would not stay and hear him. Hoyet Chastine, pastor of the Baptist church, asked the people to be seated, and let Sherrell preach to them: a few did, perhaps fifteen or twenty. The rest of the crowd marched out, while Chastine was singing a solo. It was announced on the steps for the crowd to go to the Dudley Avenue Church of Christ, which they did. There was not a threat or an ugly spirit manifested on the part of any one that I saw, and I think I saw all that happened with our people.

Members of the body of Christ are commanded to obey them that have the rule over them. We are nowhere commanded to obey him (the Elder) that has the rule over us. There is no place in the church for a one man rule. Neither is there room for majority rule. Eldership rule is clearly taught, not Elder Rule.

Elders are commanded to oversee the flock (church) that is tend or care for the sheep (Acts 20:28). Did you ever see an Elder (?) running around with the Goats and neglecting the Sheep? Will M. Thompson.
AN OPEN LETTER
M. O. DALEY

Dear Bro. Wallace :-With genuine regret I note that the brotherhood is again circularized with a special plea for R. H. Boll and, incidentally, for his theories. However, some improvement over former efforts is seen in that this one bears a signature! This plea for sympathy and leniency for its much abused (?) hero, like those in kind which have preceded it, seems unable to keep hidden "the hand of Esau" The favors sought for Boll are sought at the expense of a certain brother who was made editor of a certain religious journal which, in the past had opposed some views held by this brother before he became editor, but which, he kept under cover! With childish innocence the charge is made -with the same old knife up the sleeve! It seems that these noble defenders think that if this brother's mouth can, in some way, be stopped, the whole brotherhood will start falling over itself in its haste to do homage to their hero, who seems in great danger of losing his crown. It is claimed that only a small minority in the brotherhood is opposing the Boll theories, yet in this minority is the brother whose mouth must be stopped! Nay, nay, beloved, you are too lavish with your compliments. "The Lord has reserved to himself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." This brother is just one of a great number "striving together for the faith of the gospel." Yes, the "re-baptism question" (the one referred to in this late circular was once an issue in the brotherhood. It is also true that the paper alluded to, opposed it. But long before this brother became editor of any paper, that question ceased to be an issue in the brotherhood. Possibly, extremes were reached by both sides to the controversy, but when both sides began urging an intelligent obedience to God, and practiced accordingly, the question ceased to be an issue, and the controversy ended. When those who kept the issue alive by their preaching and practice, cease doing so, the issue will die. The same thing would happen if the Christian church should cease preaching and practicing the things that raised the issue between it and the church of Christ. The issue between the two bodies would die and fellowship would be restored. There is no denying the fact that the preaching and practice of those who favor the Boll theories, raised the issue to those who opposed these theories, it was unwelcomed. The leaders of the issue were pleaded with to desist; they would not. It then became a case of fight or surrender. They chose to fight, and no amount of "special pleading" will change the choice made. The battle is not waged on the ground of dislike for Boll, but opposition to the things for which he stands.

To cease opposing these theories because Boll is a good man, as the pleading goes, is to make them stand on lamer legs than are are safe. Is Boll the only good man among his theory defenders? I have been thinking that there were many good men among them. Why make the plea on account of the goodness of just one man? Does he have the goodness to cease teaching theories that cause strife and a breach of fellowship between brethren? Have any of his defenders ever urged him to cease his divisive teaching? Those who oppose his teaching have done so repeatedly, but with no avail. I here add my appeal to the many already made. Will you who appeal for sympathy and fellowship for him, add your appeals to him to ours? The issue is clearcut, and the responsibility for its existence is thoroughly established. Any effort to understate the well known facts in the case, is an attempt to evade, a thing to which Christians are supposed to be immune.

To leave the impression that these theories are fully set out by the statement that Boll believes the Jews will be restored to their one time land, and Christ will reign there for a thousand years, is but to make a false impression. It is true that he believes that, and it is my firm belief that it is not true. But far worse (if possible) is the destroying effects of the means he employs as proof of the truth of this claim. In attempting to establish a fact, which is admitted not to be essential, the very vitals of the whole redemption structure are ripped out, and that becomes the ground of the determined stand against such teaching. Nor is the poison extracted from it by parading before us the host of our great teachers who held some views not generally held on millennialism. If every man among us held such views, or at least the same view, that of itself would not make Boll's theories true. But, as a matter of fact, not one single man in the group paraded before us, believed what Boll believes and teaches here. Not one of them pushed his particular view to the destruction of the peace and harmony of the body, as is being done by the defenders of these theories, and over the solemn protest of some of these very men who are here put forward as believers in these views. This effort gives off a strong odor of deception.

Of the plea, "Don't break off fellowship with us"-let me ask, who started this fellowship-breaking business? Who is keeping it up? Good brethren were withdrawn from, and on many occasions when in discussion with sectarians, help was openly given the enemy by these men who now are pleading that fellowship with them be not broken, because the offense does not justify it. But it did justify (?) them in breaking fellowship with us openly when we were engaged in battle with a supposedly common enemy. The plea to not break fellowship comes too late. The fellowship is already broken, and they broke it, and on the very grounds on which we are begged by them to not break with them. Brethren, cease your useless and divisive teaching you being the Judge, and come back to the fellowship from which you broke away, and all will be peace and joy again. We cannot accept any fellowship any theory that hangs question marks all over our hope for a blessed immortality in the world to come.

M. O. Daley.
Rock Springs, Texas.

Special meetings of the church commonly called "Preacher Meetings," but of late "Lectureships" can be a blessing to the cause if properly conducted. I have helped in a number of these meetings in the past. Some of them have I think accomplished good. Others were not so good. If the purpose in these meetings is to exalt the church in the eyes of man, but above all in the eyes of God, 'then good. If the purpose is to exalt ourself as a preacher, and belittle the office of the church, then I believe it time to quit.

Too many of them are a hindrance. Too many preachers I fear are calling them Lecture Weeks, when possibly the title "Weak Lectures" would be more appropriate. Where did we get the idea of Lecture Week? From the college no doubt. We need fewer lectures and more straight-from-the-heart preaching of God's eternal, positive truth.-Will M. Thompson.